

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

THE RESOURCES BUILDING
AUDITORIUM
1416 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 2012

9:00 A.M.

EHLERT BUSINESS GROUP

(916) 851-5976

A P P E A R A N C E S

Committee Members

John Fisher, Chairman

Michael Robinson, Vice Chairman

Hamid Bahadori

Robert Bronkall

John Ciccarelli

Don Fogle

Bryan Jones

Jeff Knowles

Lt. David Ricks

Richard Shrader

Alternate Committee Members in Attendance

Mark Greenwood

Dan Gutierrez

Larry Patterson

Bill Winter

A P P E A R A N C E S

Caltrans Staff

Steve Takigawa, Deputy Director
Maintenance and Operations

Kris Kuhl, Assistant Division Chief
Traffic Operations

Devinder Singh, Committee Secretary

Bassem Barsoum
District 12

Johnny Bhullar

Roberta McLaughlin

Casey Robb

Gordon Wang

Also Present

Todd Greenwood
City of Stockton

Stephen M. Pyburn
US Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

David Royer
University of California

Mary Uhazi
California Highway Patrol

I N D E X

Page

Organization Items

1. Introduction	1
2. Membership	2
3. Approval of the Minutes of February 16, 2012	14
4. Public Comments	15

Agenda Items

5. Public Hearing

12-1	The Proposal to Amend Section 21.03 of CA MUTCD 2012 to clarify local responsibility to Establish STAA Route - Submitted by Caltrans	89
12-2	Minor editorial and policy changes requested to the Temporary Traffic Control Part 6 of the CA MUTCD 2012 - Submitted by Caltrans	16
12-2a	Proposal to amend Section 6F.60 in regards to Delineate Portable Changeable Message sign in Work Zones Areas - Submitted by Caltrans	127
12-3	Proposed amendment to Sections 6H.01 and 6A.01 of CA MUTCD 2012, Typical Applications - Submitted by LA County	132
12-4a	Proposal to amend Section 6F.65 Tubular Markers of CA MUTCD 2012 - Submitted by LA City	181
12-5	Policy changes, updates and addition of Typical Applications (TAs) to Chapter 6H of CA MUTCD 2012 and "UNEVEN PAVEMENT" - Submitted by Caltrans	186

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
5. Public Hearing (continued)	
12-8 Adopt new Section 2B.112 into the CA MUTCD 2012 to add 'MOVE OVER OR SLOW FOR STOPPED EMERGENCY OR MAINTENANCE VEHICLES" sign - Submitted by Caltrans	213
12-10 Proposal to amend CA MUTCD Section 2D.37, Destination Signs (D Series) to allow the use of Monument Supplemental Destination Sign - Submitted by Caltrans	217
12-11 Adopt Interim Approval issued by the FHWA for Optional Use of Traffic Signal Photo Enforced Signs (IA-12) - Submitted by Caltrans	246
12-12 Update the transfer method of one-lane/ two-way traffic control policy in Section 6C-12 of CA MUTCD 2012 - Submitted by Caltrans	248
6. Request for Experimentation	
10-10 Request for Permission to Experiment with modified SPEED HUMP (W17-1) Signs	240
07-19 Wildlife Corridor Signage	250
7. Information Items	250
None	
8. Next Meeting	250
9. Adjourn	253
Certificate of Reporter	254

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:08 a.m.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We'll call this meeting to order. This is the May 24th meeting of the California Traffic Control Devices; so I would like to welcome you all to this meeting.

I would like to acknowledge the location we are at. I don't think we have met here before at the Water Resources building but this is a very nice venue. It looks like there is plenty of seating and good sound equipment so congratulations to Devinder for finding a very suitable location for us today.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, may I give a few bathroom instructions.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, that is very important.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Bathrooms are located behind this wall but you need to go through the lobby and make a right and a right. The men's room is actually through another door in that hallway.

They have tightened their security here so if you have a state badge you can show the security officer your state badge. But as you walk past the security you're supposed to flash a photo ID. So whatever form that is and how they can read it from their security desk is -- but that

1 was our instruction today. There is a --

2 MR. ROYER: If I could interject. They'll let you
3 show ID and get one of the little sticker badges and then
4 you don't have to flash the ID every time. So that's
5 another way to handle it so you don't have to --

6 MS. McLAUGHLIN: At the desk?

7 MR. ROYER: At the desk.

8 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you for that additional --
9 I didn't have to do that so I wasn't given that instruction.
10 There is also a little snack bar next door here in
11 the hallway in the lobby, water and snacks in there. We are
12 asked not to bring food into the auditorium, water is fine.

13 As we approach lunch time we'll talk about lunch
14 arrangements at that time. Thank you.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you,
16 Roberta. And as always at these meetings, if we are making
17 good progress in our agenda we break for lunch. If we are
18 running behind and get bogged down on an item sometimes we
19 skip but I am hoping we can have a proper lunch break today.

20 At this point I would like to have an introduction
21 of the voting members of the Committee. And if you are an
22 alternate sitting in for a voting member today please so
23 indicate. But let's start with Mr. Ciccarelli.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's Ciccarelli.
25 John Ciccarelli, one of the two new members for Caltrans,

1 representing the needs of non-motorized travelers. (Turned
2 on microphone.) Thank you. John Ciccarelli with Caltrans.

3 Actually a member for Caltrans representing non-motorized
4 travelers.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: David Ricks, CHP, voting
6 member.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I'm Mike Robinson. I
8 represent the Southern California counties.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Don Fogle, Caltrans
10 voting member.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm John Fisher. My
12 employer is the City of Los Angeles, Department of
13 Transportation. I represent the League of California
14 Cities' Southern Branch.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My name is Jeff
16 Knowles. I work for the City of Vacaville and I represent
17 the League of California Cities' Northern Section.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I am Hamid Bahadori
19 representing the Automobile Club of Southern California,
20 AAA.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Bob Bronkall,
22 Alternate Voting Member, Northern Counties.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Bryan Jones, Caltrans
24 non-motorized representative, and my employer is the City of
25 Carlsbad.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so I see we have
2 nine of our ten members present and I think we are expecting
3 the other person to arrive shortly.

4 At this point I'd like to have those who are
5 alternate members sitting in the audience to stand up and
6 introduce themselves.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER GUTIERREZ: I'm Dan Gutierrez,
8 I'm John Ciccarelli's alternate. My voice fills the room,
9 you can hear me, right? Yes. I represent the California
10 Association of Bicycling Organizations.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Hello, I'm Larry
12 Patterson. I am the alternate for the California Cities
13 Northern Area and I am Jeff's substitute. I work for the
14 City of San Mateo.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Good morning, I'm Bill
16 Winter. I work for the Los Angeles County Department of
17 Public Works and I am the alternate to Mike Robinson.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Good morning, I'm
19 Mark Greenwood with the City of Palm Desert and I am the
20 alternate for the League of California Cities' Southern
21 Section.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you. And
23 now I'd like to ask the Caltrans support staff who are here
24 to introduce themselves.

25 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Office of

1 Science and Markings and specifically Marking Specialist.

2 MR. WANG: Gordon Wang, support staff to Johnny
3 who is the editor of the CA MUTCD.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar, editor of the CA
5 MUTCD, Caltrans.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm Devinder Singh,
7 Secretary for the Committee.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And finally,
9 any guest in the audience please stand up and introduce
10 yourself.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR TAKIGAWA: I'm Steve Takigawa, I'm
12 the Deputy Director for Maintenance and Operations at
13 Caltrans.

14 ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF KUHL: Good morning, I'm
15 Kris Kuhl. I am the Assistant Division Chief for Traffic
16 Operations, Caltrans.

17 MS. UHAZI: I am Mary Uhazi with CHP
18 Transportation Planning.

19 MR. ROYER: I'm Dave Royer, independent
20 consultant, traffic engineer and University of California
21 ITS.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Great, thank you. At
23 this point in the agenda I was asked to have Don Fogle
24 introduce a couple of our guests here.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yeah, I'd like to ask

1 Steve Takigawa, the Deputy Director for Maintenance and
2 Operations at Caltrans to step forward and make a few
3 comments to the group. Thank you, Steve.

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR TAKIGAWA: Good morning. I want
5 you to be nice because I'm a little nervous. Not about
6 speaking but usually when I'm in front of a board that's
7 sitting up higher than me it's usually because I'm getting
8 my butt chewed. (Laughter.) I feel a little more
9 comfortable so thank you very much for that.

10 One, I want to appreciate and thank you for the
11 commitment that you make with the CTCDC. I know you guys
12 have other jobs and the commitment you have here for us
13 invaluable. It's really helpful; I do appreciate that.
14 Because of all the stuff that's going on and you are able to
15 make it here, we have nine of the ten and possibly the
16 tenth, I really appreciate that so thank you for that.

17 I do have a couple of things. And basically it is
18 John's retirement, is what I hear. And so what was kind of
19 funny is people were giving me some notes and I'm like, God,
20 it's going to suck that we're going to lose this guy,
21 because of some of the stuff that we're having. (Laughter.)

22 So I just want to read off some of this stuff because I
23 don't know you personally. But some of the stuff here I
24 know was valuable to Caltrans over the last 14 years.

25 My director, our new director and a change now

1 from acting, but Malcolm Dougherty wanted to be here to
2 present it. He is unable to be here, he is not even in town
3 so I guess you get probably fourth string in Caltrans so I
4 apologize for that. (Laughter.)

5 So anyway I just wanted to, we wanted to give a
6 little brief history of your work here. John was appointed
7 to the CTCDC in 1998. He served as a voting member, twice
8 as a vice chair and three times as the chairman. He worked
9 with the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control
10 Devices to achieve consistency in uniformity between the
11 California manual and the national manual.

12 One of the things that I read in here is he is
13 always reviewing the agenda meeting minutes thoroughly,
14 providing his comments, even within a few hours. And if I
15 could get all my staff to do that it would be really
16 helpful.

17 John's wisdom and leadership greatly helped
18 Caltrans provide uniformity in the utilization of the
19 traffic control devices in California. There was a lot of
20 stuff that the voting members, the Secretary and the CA
21 MUTCD branch often talked about your commitment, your
22 professionalism and your thoughtful comments.

23 You have also suggested numerous changes to the
24 functionality of the CTCDC that have proved to be very
25 effective. One of the prominent changes was to use the

1 experimentation process. John implemented requiring final
2 recommendations in new traffic control devices based on
3 documented experimentation.

4 With your help developed three comprehensive
5 editions over the last several years.

6 And I wanted to read this exactly how someone gave
7 it to me because I think this will is probably -- will chime
8 in with a lot of people that have been with you over the
9 years.

10 John, these are all significant accomplishments,
11 the contribution you made to this committee during the last
12 14 years. Your leadership, your guidance, your partnership,
13 these have all been a proven success with successful results
14 and your efforts and dedication are greatly appreciated.

15 On behalf of the California Department of
16 Transportation, all California road users, I thank you very
17 much, John, and I wish you good luck, good health and great
18 joy in your retirement.

19 And I have a -- I have a letter here from our
20 Director that is congratulating you in appreciation so I'd
21 like to present that to you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Steve, thank you very
23 much.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Steve, we need to take
25 a picture now.

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR TAKIGAWA: We've got to take a
2 picture. And I also have a plaque that I'd like to -- there
3 is also a plaque here. The California Traffic Control
4 Devices Committee presented to John E. Fisher, and I'll read
5 it all.

6 The California Department of Transportation and
7 the California Traffic Control Devices Committee hereby
8 recognizes your 14 years of dedicated and tireless
9 professional services to the road users of the State of
10 California.

11 As the representative for the League of California
12 Cities from 1998 to 2012 your commitment to traffic safety
13 and uniformity of traffic control devices is an inspiration
14 to the traffic engineering profession.

15 Your contribution to the transition of the State
16 Traffic Manual to the CA MUTCD is significant and your vast
17 wisdom helped develop a very comprehensive publication used
18 throughout California.

19 On behalf of Caltrans and all the CTCDC members
20 past and present we thank you for your outstanding service
21 on the CTCDC and to the state of California.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Wow. Thank you very
23 much.

24 (Applause.)

25 (Photographs were taken.)

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me just thank
2 Caltrans and Steve for the nice words. I certainly didn't
3 expect a letter from the Director of Caltrans. I had a
4 dinner hosted on my behalf last night and I didn't expect
5 anything more than that. I had a great time but I want to
6 thank you for the acknowledgement.

7 (Applause.)

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I have
9 had the pleasure of serving on the California Traffic
10 Control Devices Committee almost nine years, it will be nine
11 years the coming September, and I have known John Fisher for
12 almost 25 years, I met him first in 1987. And from our very
13 first meeting at an ITE function I was truly impressed by
14 his technical knowledge, his demeanor and his friendly
15 approach to his colleagues.

16 I represent the Automobile Club of Southern
17 California on the Devices Committee. We have 10 million
18 members in California, 52 million members nationally. The
19 Auto Club started in 1900 and both Caltrans and CHP are the
20 products of the efforts that the Auto Club started, road
21 services and the standardization and uniformity of traffic
22 controls and all that. So there is a big affinity between
23 us and these two agencies and the Devices Committee.

24 As for John, other than being a great friend, it's
25 always so good to have someone in your profession that when

1 you have a question you can go to. And you know that he has
2 the expertise and he has the time and he has the care.
3 Whenever I have a question, anything traffic-related, the
4 first person that comes to my mind is John Fisher. And I
5 bug him with my emails. The questions that come to me from
6 other colleagues that I am not that sure I always -- even
7 when I am sure I always ask for a second opinion, I go to
8 John. And he has always been there.

9 And John, on behalf of all our members, 10 million
10 members in California, one-half million members in Los
11 Angeles, we would like to thank you for your years of
12 dedicated service.

13 And we wanted to leave you with something. And
14 those of you who have been to our archives in downtown LA at
15 the corner of Figueroa and Adams, you know that we have
16 36,000 pieces of historic pictures transportation and
17 traffic related. And I said, okay. I asked our Chief
18 Historian, who is a great friend of John also, Matt Roth, to
19 go through our archives and see if we can find any picture
20 from John's early career.

21 And he said, I have to go -- and he said, ahh. So
22 what year am I looking at? Am I looking 1930, 1940? I said
23 no, no, don't look. (Laughter.)

24 So he went through the archives and he found
25 something that we think it might be John, we are not sure.

1 Anyway, we have a picture that we would like -- this is
2 probably one of the very first experimentation requests that
3 Caltrans was undertaking and we think this was John's
4 project. And this gentleman looks awfully familiar but his
5 back is to us. So we think it's John but we don't know.

6 (Laughter.)

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: This is so cool. This
8 is so cool. This is a picture of the traffic signal that
9 the Auto Club installed in front of their headquarters in
10 1924. It was a one-of-a-kind signal and it lasted for about
11 seven years. And you know why it didn't last longer than
12 that? It was in the middle of the street and I think it got
13 hit.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It got hit so many
15 times.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It got hit and then
17 they put up an Acme signal. But I really treasure this
18 because as some of you know, I am into history and
19 especially the history of transportation in Southern
20 California and this is certainly part of it.

21 That's not me. (Laughter.) Maybe it looks a
22 little bit like me from the back. But I truly value this
23 and I want to sincerely thank you.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thank you for your
25 service and your friendship, sir.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll just keep it
4 brief and say a few words because I talked yesterday at the
5 dinner that we had. I have enjoyed very much being a part
6 of this Committee. I don't necessarily want to leave at
7 this time but I am going to retire so I have no choice in
8 the matter. But it's truly been an honor and a privilege to
9 serve on this Committee and to serve as your Chairman for
10 several years.

11 I think the future of this Committee is very
12 bright. We have many challenges but I think we have put
13 together a good team of people, especially with the new
14 people who have come on board through the expansion of the
15 Committee, so I feel very good about it.

16 Thank you for your kind words and thank you for
17 the opportunity to serve the state of California and traffic
18 control device uniformity.

19 (Applause.)

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Steve, thanks again.

21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: We have a request here.
22 Apparently BlackBerries interfere with the recording system
23 -- the sound system, not necessarily her recording. So if
24 you have a BlackBerry or a cell phone, airplane mode is
25 appreciated. Which means, I guess, you can see your

1 incoming but you will not be able to call out during the
2 meeting. Is that correct?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: There is no cell phone
4 reception in the room anyway.

5 MS. McLAUGHLIN: That's that little repeated buzz
6 in the microphones. It's caused, she says, by cell phones.
7 We'll see. If it becomes bothersome and interferes with
8 the recording we may have to try something else. Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you,
10 Roberta.

11 Are there any requests to take any agenda items
12 out of order?

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, Item number 1. we
14 will move to like after ten o'clock.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, we have had a
16 request to move Item 12-1 until after ten o'clock. Any
17 other requests for out of order agenda items?

18 Okay. We now go to Item number 3, which is
19 approval of the minutes from our February 16th meeting. I
20 assume we have reviewed the minutes. Do we have a motion to
21 approve the minutes?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: So moved.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Second.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All in favor

1 say aye.

2 (Ayes.)

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Minutes so
4 approved.

5 On Item number 4, we will entertain any comments
6 from the public. Keep in mind that if there already is an
7 agenda item for this you may not speak to it at this point
8 in time, you may speak to that item when it comes up. But
9 if there is anything you would like to discuss that is not
10 on the agenda now would be the opportunity to do so. Please
11 keep your comments brief and concise. And when you come up
12 to the podium please clearly state your name and your
13 affiliation for the record. Are there any public comments?

14 Okay, hearing none we will go to our regular
15 agenda items.

16 This satisfies Section 21400 of the California
17 Vehicle Code, where prior to adopting rules and regulations
18 that prescribe uniform traffic control devices the
19 Department of Transportation, Caltrans, is required to
20 consult with local agencies and hold a public hearing. So
21 before we adopt or consider adopting any of the items under
22 12-1 through 12-12 we must go through this process.

23 So at this point we will go to Agenda Item 12-2,
24 which includes editorial and policy changes related to Part
25 6 of the CA MUTCD. Don, that's your item. And that is on

1 pages 10 through 24 of your agenda.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 As I go through here I am going to ask the Caltrans staff
4 in attendance to assist with any questions that come up.

5 During the last meeting the Committee asked that
6 we separate the minor and editorial changes for Part 6 from
7 the rest of the Part 6 items in order to expedite the
8 review. So Caltrans has gone through all the proposed Part
9 6 changes and put the minor and editorial changes under this
10 item. You will notice that there is a chart on page 10 of
11 62 that explains in detail the sections that are involved
12 and the background information so we'll just run through
13 those.

14 Basically the items will fall under one of four
15 categories. It's either a known error but not as simple as
16 a typo, it's a deletion of Caltrans-only policies as
17 directed by the Committee previously, inconsistencies within
18 the manual, or language was directly copied over from a
19 Caltrans specification and needs to be revised to the CA
20 MUTCD style.

21 For Section 6C.10 we have added a policy or a
22 reference to a policy for low-volume roads and it is defined
23 as in Part 5. We don't have page numbers but if you jump
24 back a few pages to the next page, Page 11, 6C-10 One-Lane,
25 Two-Way Traffic Control. We have added "Support: See

1 Section 5A.01 for definition of a low-volume road where
2 paragraph 5 is applied." Are there any comments from the
3 Committee regarding that suggestion?

4 Okay. The next item is Section 6F.22. And for
5 that one the W20-5a sign is shown on Figure 6F-4. It was
6 left out from the California text of Section 6F.22. So if
7 we look in that section, 6F.22, you will see that under the
8 Option we have added "LANE(S) CLOSED (W20-5a)" to the Option
9 section. Are there any comments or suggestions regarding
10 that proposal?

11 Okay. The next one is 6F.37. And for that one,
12 terms like "maintenance, reconstruction, et cetera" do not
13 include works such as landscaping, garbage removing, et
14 cetera and should be replaced with "shoulder works."

15 And so if we jump back to 6F.37, which is on page
16 12, under the Option section we have deleted "maintenance"
17 and "reconstruction" and substituted or added the words
18 "shoulder work" instead. Are there any comments or
19 suggestions from the Committee regarding that proposal?

20 Okay, the next item is Section 6F.68. And
21 according to an FHWA memorandum WZ-54, all barricades need
22 to be crash tested with temporary traffic control signs as
23 one unit.

24 This is on page 12. And you will note under
25 Section 6F.68 in the Option section we have deleted the

1 prior reference to Type III and simply used the word
2 "barricades" which is all-encompassing for all barricades.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Don?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes, John.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: In the added text --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Do you want to use your
7 microphone, John?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Certainly. In the
9 modified text is it understood by practitioners what the
10 nature of the crash tests should be?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I believe it is but
12 Johnny, could you respond to that. Or Gordon. I'm sorry,
13 Gordon, I didn't see you there.

14 MR. WANG: Gordon Wang from Caltrans. To respond
15 to that question, the crash testing requirement is defined
16 elsewhere in Chapter 6F.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Any other comments?

19 The next item is Section 6F.88. Traffic screen
20 mounted on top of barriers are mostly made of plywood, they
21 are gray in color or wood-tone and not orange. No color
22 policy is needed and so that should be deleted from that
23 section. That is on page 12. Excuse me, page 12 and 13.
24 The actual modification shows up on page 13 under Guidance.
25 And we have deleted the words "and orange or red-orange in

1 color" so that the new Guidance for paragraph 3b: "If used,
2 temporary traffic screen panels should be contiguous without
3 gaps, minimum 32 inches in height." Any comments or
4 suggestions regarding that proposal?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, yes, Hamid.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What is the reason for
8 deleting the color reference?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: The color reference is
10 deleted because in practice we are not using colors now. We
11 don't see colors on these devices and so we are simply
12 trying to make the policy fit the practice.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So the agencies that
14 still use the colored signs, they are going to be out of
15 compliance?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: No, we are not requiring
17 any specific color.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: And these are, again, for
20 temporary traffic screens.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I know the kinds
22 of screens that they use. And then -- okay. So by -- okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Any other questions,
24 comments, suggestions for Section 6F.88?

25 Okay, the next item is Section 6F.101-103(CA) and

1 this is a language cleanup. Those policies were written for
2 specifications and they need to be more in line with the CA
3 MUTCD style.

4 The first item, 6F.101(CA) is on page 13. And we
5 have added -- under "Option" we have added "See Section
6 6C.01." And I am not sure what that refers to. Gordon,
7 could you give us a brief explanation on what that covers?

8 MR. WANG: Section 6C.01 is a general section for
9 temporary traffic control warning signs. And this is Gordon
10 Wang from Caltrans.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, thank you, Gordon.
12 And also on that one we have modified the standard to
13 change the language and also add some reference to the miles
14 per hour. We have deleted the word "coat" and added the
15 word "chip" and also added "mph" behind "35" which is
16 consist with the CA MUTCD language requirements and also
17 added "be used to." And so the total or the complete
18 paragraph 6 under Standard is, the new paragraph is: "On
19 State highways for chip seal project, the W.13-1 (35 mph)
20 plaque shall be used to supplement the W8-7 sign during
21 placing and/or brooming of screenings."

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have a question on
25 this one. One thing fundamentally we have been discussing

1 is not to have two standards for state highways or any other
2 type of roadway. So on this one I know this is not, we are
3 not changing any part of that. But since the item is under
4 consideration why is it that this standard shall apply only
5 to state highways and not to other roadways?

6 In my neighborhood -- I'm familiar with the
7 neighborhoods in my county where I live, in Orange County.
8 Beach Boulevard and Brookhurst and Magnolia and all those
9 other streets are running parallel and they're exactly
10 identical, the same type arterials. Or Pacific Coast
11 Highway is very similar to all the other major streets that
12 intersect Pacific Coast Highway.

13 So as far as the motorist is concerned, t he
14 jurisdictional authority and who owns and maintains and
15 operates that street is not relevant, the nature and the
16 characteristics of the roadway is. So why is it you are
17 applying a standard to a state highway when a roadway owned
18 by a county or a city with similar characteristics is
19 exempt? As a matter of policy question I thought we have
20 had this discussion before, that we don't want to have two
21 sets of different standards, one for state highways and one
22 for other municipal highways.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: The reason that the state
24 highways was retained in this case is because many
25 residential streets and local roads have a speed limit

1 that's less than 35 miles an hour and so we were simply
2 updating the mile per hour reference to 35. We did retain
3 the state highways, again, just to provide that flexibility
4 to the local agencies. And certainly we can take that back
5 under advisement. But that was the rationale was that we
6 didn't want to lock in local agencies to the 35 mile per
7 hour plaque if in fact their local streets and roads are
8 already signed less than that.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand. I can't
10 think of any state highway that I know that has a speed
11 limit of less than 35. But again back to the point that I
12 was trying to make, a lot of state highways are in areas
13 that when the motorist is riding in that area he or she does
14 not know and does not care who owns this highway. So
15 highways under similar characteristics with geographic
16 layout, traffic volumes, number of lanes, the drivers don't
17 know who owns this highway and they don't care and they
18 shouldn't.

19 So if there is a standard that we think is a good
20 standard and we want to apply it to the state highways, then
21 I think other highways in similar conditions should also be
22 required for that safety feature also. That is why we have
23 been discussing not to have two different set of standards,
24 one for the state highway, one for others.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think Mr. Bahadori

1 brings up a good point and one that has come up recurrently
2 on this committee and one that we have tried to correct as
3 they come up.

4 I understand Mr. Fogle's perspective that you
5 don't want to require this on low-speed local roads. One
6 way of handling this is to say, instead of on state
7 highways, to indicate some other criteria. On streets with
8 posted speed limits of 40 miles an hour or more, comma, the
9 sign shall be used. That would be a way of handling it.
10 but I do support the sense of Mr. Bahadori's comment that
11 this is a manual for all jurisdictions in California and we
12 have been trying to get away that on state highways you do
13 this but no mention on what you do on the county road that
14 has a 55 mile an hour speed limit.

15 So I am wondering, having heard these comments, if
16 you would entertain a friendly motion to strike out the
17 words "on state highways" and insert some other language
18 such as "on roads with speed limits of 40 miles an hour or
19 more, comma." Would you want to -- so would you entertain
20 that as a friendly motion to your proposal?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I would second that
22 motion.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I would like to ask the
24 staff, either Gordon or Johnny, to address that.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I

1 wanted to give a little bit of background as most of the
2 members that have been working on this Committee for a
3 whole, we have -- we have looked at this issue in detail
4 before. And basically I think we had talked about it but we
5 never took up as a task upon ourselves to really change all,
6 or at least to highlight, all the old state highway-type of
7 issues and then look at them. If we take that out, how does
8 that impact local agencies?

9 So having said that, of course, that's something
10 that surely in the future we could work on and try to
11 highlight all of them. But this item is in front of us. Of
12 course the reason why we don't have -- at least we didn't
13 change it here is because that was not the portion that we
14 were trying to change. But we are always open to, if local
15 agencies want to go with the standard that we are trying to
16 dictate a minimum for the state highway, of course suddenly
17 we are open to the local agencies going with that. And of
18 course if we want to just on this particular item, change
19 it, but all means we can address that.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: So it sounds like yes, we
21 would be open to that.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I think
23 your suggestion is a good one because I think when it comes
24 to traffic safety standards it's the -- the ownership and
25 who owns what facility is not really important. The

1 important thing is the characteristics of the highway. So
2 in this case if we have the clarification that defines it as
3 you suggested, Mr. Chairman, that ties it with the speed
4 limit of the highway, that is probably more appropriate than
5 who owns the highway. So I would support what you suggested
6 and I think you have the second to say that on highways
7 where the posted speed limit -- not posted. On highways
8 with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour or higher.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I guess if Don
10 agrees this will be a friendly amendment my understanding is
11 we don't need a second.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Because we would adopt
14 it as part of the adoption of this whole item. But do you
15 accept that as a friendly amendment?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes, we accept that.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So the new
18 language would say: "On highways with posted speed limits of
19 40 miles per hour or higher."

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'd suggest not even
21 say posted because if it is not posted it is prima facia 55
22 or 65.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Speed limits. So --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So we just say "speed
25 limit."

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: "On highways with
2 speed limits of 40 miles per hour or higher." That would
3 replace the words "state highways." So that's a friendly
4 amendment that's been approved. Continue, Don.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. The next item,
6 6F.102. We have simply modified the guidance on that one in
7 reference section 6C.01 and stricken out 2C.08. Gordon, did
8 you have anything you would like to add?

9 MR. WANG: This is Gordon from Caltrans. A quick
10 correction to my earlier response also to this chapter.
11 Section 6C.01 is the chapter, the policy where it states
12 words on speed limit reduction policy. And both the 6F.101
13 and 6F.102 are referred to that -- words on speed limit
14 reduction. And crossing out 2C.08, that was the permanent
15 speed limit reduction policy, that's an error. And that was
16 -- this proposal just to correct that.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Are there any comments or
18 suggestions about that proposal?

19 Okay, the next item is 6F.103(CA) Open Trench
20 Sign. And for that one the changes are on page 14 under
21 Guidance paragraph 03 we have deleted the reference to
22 "portable" and "on Type II barricades." The new Guidance
23 would read: "Trenches in excess of 0.15 feet in depth but
24 not exceeding 0.25 feet in depth that are less than 8 feet
25 from the edge of traveled way should be identified by LOW

1 SHOULDER (w8-9) signs set in the trench adjacent to the edge
2 of pavement at intervals not to exceed 2,000 feet."

3 We have also modified the standard to add in "but
4 less than 2.5 feet" and the word "alternating." We have
5 deleted the word "portable" in front of "signs" and deleted
6 "on Type II or Type III barricades alternately" and the word
7 "every." So the new standard proposed for Paragraph 05 is
8 "Trenches in excess of 0.25 feet but less than 2.5 feet in
9 depth that are less than 8 feet from the edge of traveled
10 way shall be identified by alternating C27(CA) and NO
11 SHOULDER (C31A(CA)) signs set in the trench at intervals not
12 to exceed 2,000 feet.

13 Under "Guidance, paragraph 06. We have added the
14 word "portable" in front of "delineators" and we have added
15 "for above condition." The new paragraph 06 proposal is --
16 excuse me, Roberta, did we want to add the word "California"
17 here? Was that an oversight for the Channelizers?

18 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Parentheses, CA, parentheses.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: At the very beginning of
20 the paragraph.

21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay.

23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: After the word "channelizer."

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: There is another change
25 that doesn't show up on the agendas along with that

1 Guidance. After the word "Channelizers," the first word, in
2 parentheses we would have "CA." So the new Guidance
3 paragraph 06 will read: "Channelizers (CA) or portable
4 delineators should be placed 2 feet to 6 feet outside of the
5 edge line at 100 feet intervals for above condition."

6 In paragraph 07 --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is that what you want
8 for above condition or for the condition described above?
9 It's editorial but it just doesn't read right.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. I haven't been
11 giving opportunities for comments --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: -- so far but we can
14 change that. I was going to cover all the changes proposed
15 because --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: -- some of the comments
18 may affect multiple sections.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Sure.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: So I'll continue and then
21 we will ask for comments and suggestions. Paragraph 07,
22 trenches and -- I'm sorry. In paragraph 07 we deleted the
23 word "portable" in front of signs. We have also deleted "on
24 Type II or Type III barricades." In the last sentence of
25 that paragraph we have added the word "Portable" in front of

1 "delineators."

2 So the new Guidance paragraph 07 will read:

3 "Trenches in excess of 0.25 feet in depth but not exceeding
4 2.5 feet in dept that are 8 feet to 15 feet from the edge of
5 traveled way should be identified y C27(CA) signs set in the
6 trench at intervals not to exceed 2,000 feet. Portable
7 delineators should be placed at 200 feet intervals within 2
8 feet from the edge of the trench and at 100 feet intervals
9 for edge conditions exceeding 0.5 feet in depth."

10 The last change that we propose is to paragraph 08
11 Guidance. We are proposing to add the word "portable" in
12 front of "delineators." So the new proposed Guidance
13 paragraph 08 will read: "Trenches in excess of 0.5 feet in
14 depth but not exceeding 2.5 feet in depth that are more than
15 15 feet from the edge of traveled way at location where a
16 recovery area was available prior to construction should be
17 identified by placing portable delineators at 200 feet
18 intervals within 2 feet from the edge of the trench and by
19 placing C27(CA) signs in the trench at intervals not to
20 exceed 2,000 feet."

21 Those are quite a few changes. Are there any
22 comments or suggestions about that proposal?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman,

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It's not as much a

1 question, I have no problem with the change, just maybe more
2 curiosity. Why are we adding "portable?" Is there any
3 reason? Something happened in the field that we need to
4 clarify?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'd like to refer that
6 question to Gordon or Johnny.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because it has been
8 like this for years.

9 MR. WANG: This is Gordon from Caltrans and the
10 question is, why are we adding "portable" in front of
11 "delineators?" We are basically trying to differentiate the
12 permanent delineator policy compared to portable delineator
13 policies.

14 Most permanent delineators are attached to a
15 structure such as a K-rail or affixed to the pavement,
16 versus open trench conditions. The policy was originally
17 intended to use the portable delineators, it just wasn't
18 spelled out in the wordings. Which is a candle-shaped
19 orange tube with a weighted base and can be moved around
20 quite a bit.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have no problem with
23 it, I'm just saying it's been like this for years. I was
24 wondering if something happened. If there was an accident
25 or something happened that caused this change. Okay, no

1 problem.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. The next item on
4 the chart is Section 6F --

5 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Excuse me, Mr. Fisher had
6 something earlier.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, it was just an
8 editorial consideration. In paragraph 06 Guidance. My only
9 editorial proposal was where you have "for above condition."
10 I was going to say it would probably read a little bit
11 better if it said "for the condition described above."

12 MR. WANG: This is Gordon Wang from Caltrans and I
13 agree with that editorial change.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So if you would
15 consider that a friendly amendment.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Can you say again?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Replace the word
18 "above condition" with "the condition described above."

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: If Gordon likes it then I
20 agree to it. Any other comments about that proposal?

21 Okay, the next item is section 6F.106(CA). And
22 apparently Caltrans bought some roll-up signs, SC19(CA)
23 signs to be used at lane closures. The sign location policy
24 needs to be changed so that roll-up signs can be used. That
25 is on page 14 at the bottom. And we have modified or

1 deleted the Guidance paragraph and added a new Option
2 paragraph. So we have also deleted the old wording that was
3 part of the Guidance.

4 So the new Paragraph 02, which will be part of the
5 Option section will read: "If used, SC19(CA) and/or SC20(CA)
6 signs may be used within the advance warning area,
7 transition area, or activity area of a Temporary Traffic
8 Control Zone." And that's all it will say. Gordon, did you
9 have anything you would like to add to my comments before I
10 ask for any other comments?

11 MR. WANG: Nothing at this time.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. Are there any
13 comments or suggestions about that proposal?

14 Okay. The next items are 6H TA-5,101(CA) and
15 102(CA) and we are deleting policies. So that would be on
16 page 15. And under the Standard the prior paragraph 7, that
17 would be deleted. And the prior paragraph 7 said: "The
18 minimum offset from the upstream end of the barrier to the
19 edge of the traveled way shall be at least 15 feet unless
20 shielded by a crash cushion."

21 The proposal is to delete that because it is
22 effectively covered in paragraph 8, which will now be
23 renumbered as paragraph 7. The new paragraph 7 will say:
24 "Temporary traffic barriers, including their end treatments,
25 shall be crashworthy. In order to mitigate the effect of

1 striking the upstream end of a temporary traffic barrier the
2 end shall be installed in accordance with AASHTO's Roadside
3 Design Guide (see Section 1A.11) by flaring until the end is
4 outside the acceptable clear zone or by providing
5 crashworthy end treatments. See Section 6F.85 for more
6 details." Are there any questions or comments about that
7 proposal?

8 MR. WANG: I would like to add one more thing.
9 This same proposal applies to three different sections we
10 are going to see later, or do you want to look at the other
11 two sections right now?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I would like to just
13 continue along with the way the chart is laid out.

14 MR. WANG: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, for 6H TA-6, 11,
16 15, 16, 18 and 26. We are defining low-volume road as in
17 Part 5. So on page 15 is the first place this shows up.
18 Under "Support" we are proposing a new sentence that says:
19 "Note 3 is applied on a low-volume road as defined in
20 Section 3A.01 (sic).

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: 5A.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'm sorry, 5A.01.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I do have
24 a question about this.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Jeff.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Let me ask, is now the
2 time?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: No, let me just also add
4 that under "Standard" we have deleted paragraph 14 in total.
5 The old paragraph 14 read "Note 3 shall not be applicable
6 for State highways. Note #1 shall be used instead of State
7 highways." And that was done because we didn't want to talk
8 about state highways, right, Gordon?

9 MR. WANG: That's correct.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Any comments or questions
11 about this proposal?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Jeff.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I've been running back
14 and forth to the rest of the MUTCD to make sure I understood
15 the definition used in Section 5A.01. Is it your
16 understanding that we can't then use any of these low-volume
17 standards in urban areas? In our urban area, like in the
18 signal warrants, is defined pretty much by the built-up
19 population, not necessarily that it's in a busy downtown
20 area like Sacramento here. But, you know, even in our
21 suburban neighborhoods in built-up incorporated cities. And
22 my concern is, I've got cul-de-sacs, I've got low-volume
23 residential streets that as far as I can tell --

24 It may have always been the intent that it only be
25 used in rural areas, that may have been your intent. But

1 when I read in the past "low-volume" I would apply that to
2 my cul-de-sacs, my very minor residential streets. And by
3 shifting to the definition in Section 5A.01 I think I can't
4 use these exceptions in my city anymore because it has to be
5 a rural area. Then I'm concerned about that.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Johnny or Gordon, would
7 you like to comment?

8 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
9 Basically what we are doing here is going to be referring
10 to, of course, Section 5A.01. And you are correct, in that
11 section the definition refers to the AADT of 400 or less as
12 well as it cannot be a state highway.

13 However, if you look at -- at least for 6H-6, the
14 notes -- Note number 1 says that you should be maintaining
15 10 foot lanes. And the only issue here in terms of the low-
16 volume road definition is that for a low-volume definition,
17 that criteria you can -- Note number 3 says that you shall
18 be maintaining for a minimum lane width of 9 feet may be
19 used. So you still can use the application. It's just that
20 if it's a low-volume then you can go down to 9 feet,
21 Otherwise you need to maintain 10 feet.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But it means I can't do
23 9 -- well, like in Section 6C.10. That means even on a cul-
24 de-sac I need flagman control. Because again we have
25 shifted it just from a low-volume street to the low-volume

1 street as defined in 5A.01, which seems to be just -- I
2 mean, and I am putting this open to the Committee. Is
3 anybody else reading it that way? That John, could you use
4 this in your LA neighborhoods? It seems like our
5 communities represent urban areas and we couldn't then use
6 this low-volume standard, even on very low-volume streets.

7 MR. BHULLAR: But Jeff, before we dig into it just
8 be aware that all we are trying to do here is define what
9 low-volume is already mentioned. So we are not really
10 changing anything, we are just being more explicit as to
11 what the meaning of the low-volume is.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. The only
13 trouble was in that particular section where they used that
14 definition of low-volume for the low-volume section in the
15 MUTCD it's really a low-volume rural roadway and most of my
16 roadways aren't rural, they're suburban. So by specifically
17 using this definition we cannot treat our low-volume roads
18 the way we have been treating our low-volume roads.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The way that I read
20 this is that the notes and the figure can apply in a
21 suburban or urban area. It's only that for Note 3 where it
22 says you have to maintain a minimum lane width of 9 feet.
23 That would only apply in the rural area on a street with
24 less than 400 AADT.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, but for example,

1 if you look at the previous section we discussed, 6C.10
2 where they are talking about flagman control. You have got
3 an exclusion in paragraph 05 using the same definition. So
4 I waited until the next time we were talking about this
5 definition.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What page are you on?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Page 11 of this
8 package. So paragraph 05 there is an exclusion for using
9 flagmen where there is clear visibility and, you know, you
10 are down to a single lane control, right? A cul-de-sac,
11 very minor residential street, and you've got this exclusion
12 for low-volume streets with good visibility. Well, you
13 can't use that exclusion in an urban area when we change to
14 that definition.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I see your point.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: We still have a very
17 low volume road, a low speed road, 25 mile an hour. But all
18 of a sudden now you have to have flagmen even on a cul-de-
19 sac.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, there are many
21 situations where you have a residential street and 600 AADT
22 in a urban area where some would judge that flagger control
23 would be okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Or excessive. You'd
25 have many examples where --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It would be okay --
2 but let me see. Or the self-regulation --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, would be okay.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- would be okay. I
5 think you raise an interesting point. When we say "low-
6 volume road" are we referring to the same definition that's
7 in Part 5? I don't know that that was the intent. I
8 thought the intent was local type streets, basically. So
9 was there a -- I'd like to better understand the rationale
10 for typing this to the definition in Part 5.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Pretty much the national MUTCD as
12 well as the CA MUTCD when it says low-volume roads in
13 parentheses it is trying to tie it to Section 5A.01. We
14 were just trying to be -- trying to be consistent here. But
15 I do hear, yes, Jeff's concern and maybe I think on that
16 note we want to make sure that the definition of low-volume
17 is consistently applied. But the
18 manual throughout is tying it to Section 5A.01.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: I would like to also
20 chime in that in Section 5A.01 the very first sentence says
21 "A low-volume road shall be defined for this part of the
22 manual as follows." So it was very clear the Chapter 5
23 definition was meant to be for Chapter 5, not necessarily
24 for the rest of the manual based on that first sentence.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, in Part

1 6, 6A.01, paragraph 15 on page 1020 of the current MUTCD it
2 says: A determination as to whether a particular facility at
3 a particular time of day can be considered to be a high-
4 volume roadway or can be considered to be a low-volume
5 roadway is made, California language, as defined in Part 5.

6 So there is already a reference in the 2012 California
7 MUTCD to using Part 5 for that determination. I am not
8 defending it, I am just noting it.

9 MR. BHULLAR: And by that same token the
10 definition in Part 1 that we have for conventional roads,
11 definition number 41 for conventional roads says it is a
12 street or highway other than a low-volume road ,and in
13 parentheses, as defined in Section 5A.01. So Part 1
14 typically applies to the entire manual. So when they are
15 talking about a conventional road and the definition being a
16 street or highway other than a low-volume road in
17 parentheses, so that does exclude and make that a low-volume
18 road.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What I couldn't find
20 per that definition was -- and now I'm going from memory --
21 the definition of a built-up urban area and exactly what
22 they are referring to. Because that is the exclusion that
23 is catching me is not the volume itself but the fact that
24 all of a sudden I can't use it in suburbia. Because by
25 other definitions elsewhere we call what, over 10,000

1 population an urban area? Even though it can be very semi-
2 rural in feel or, you know, very low-intensity development.

3 MR. BHULLAR: And Jeff, you are very keen to pick
4 up on that because that is one of the changes in the new
5 manual that the feds when they were looking at and making
6 the changes they did define and make changes to the low-
7 volume road definition in Part 5. And the one that you
8 described for the urban, they did add that in. So that is
9 something recent --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So the urban is new.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, it is new.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Devinder, the language
13 that you referred to just a moment ago -- I'm sorry, Johnny.
14 Johnny, the language to which you referred where you said
15 Part 6 already clarified what a low-volume road is. Can you
16 identify where that is again?

17 MR. BHULLAR: No, actually I was identifying Part
18 1 in the definition, in Part 1 under definitions. It's on
19 page 79 of the manual. I think -- does it show up here?
20 Let me enlarge it.

21 (The Manual was projected.)

22 MR. BHULLAR: Number 41 there it says:
23 "Conventional road, a street or highway other than a low-
24 volume road." And in parentheses it says "as defined in
25 Section 5A.01." And basically Part 1 is applicable to the

1 entire manual so I am taking that to assume that the
2 conventional road cannot be a low-volume road. It is a
3 street or highway other than --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But I don't
5 see how that means that a low-volume road in Part 6 is
6 subject to the restrictions in Part 5. Maybe I'm missing
7 something.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, I think
9 it was me that made the comment. In Part 6A -- Section
10 6A.01, paragraph 15, California-specific language refers a
11 practitioner to Part 5 for determination of low-volume.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: 6A.01?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: 6A.01 page 1020,
14 paragraph 15. The words "as defined in Part 5."

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And that -- I
16 note that that is language added for California. Devinder,
17 (sic) was that a change made in the most recent version that
18 wasn't there before? It used to read "as made by the public
19 agency or official having jurisdiction" and it was changed
20 to "as defined in Part 5." Is that a recent change?

21 MR. BHULLAR: No, I do not believe that is a
22 recent change.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

24 MR. BHULLAR: But I can verify that if you give me
25 a moment.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Since we are talking
4 about the 5A.01 and that's the place that actually defines
5 the low-volume road. It may be worth it if we all are on
6 the same page. Over there -- if you allow me, it says: "A
7 low-volume road shall be defined for this part of the Manual
8 as follows." But since in Section 6 we are saying,
9 referring back to 5A then that preempts this one and this
10 means that this applies to Section 6 as well.

11 And it defines it in two ways, it says: "A low-
12 volume road can be a facility lying outside of built-up
13 areas of cities, towns and communities and it shall have a
14 traffic volume of less than 400 AADT." And the second
15 condition it says: "A low-volume road shall not be a
16 freeway, an expressway, an interchange ramp, a freeway
17 service road or a road on a designated state highway system
18 or a residential street in a neighborhood. In terms of
19 highway classification it shall be a variation of a
20 conventional road or a special purpose road as defined in
21 Section 1A.13."

22 So I think this kind of addresses what Mr. Knowles
23 was talking about in terms of both the built-up areas and
24 residential streets in neighborhoods.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jeff, any other

1 comments related to this issue?

2 MR. WANG: We have a comment from Steve.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

4 MR. PYBURN: Either now or --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is it important to
6 make the comment now?

7 MR. PYBURN: Since it's not a standard statement,
8 no, no.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

10 MR. PYBURN: If you want to take it now or later
11 it's up to you.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I guess we want
13 to get through the presentation of this and then have a
14 discussion on it and then we'll -- we'll do that in the
15 appropriate order. Even though it is a support statement it
16 is a momentous statement. I think it's a legitimate area to
17 discuss regarding what the intent of that was.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That was what I wanted
19 to make clear during the presentation. Was it the intent,
20 of this definition clearly states, that we cannot use any of
21 these low-volume standards on a residential street. Because
22 that is in that definition.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Because then we've got
24 an awful lot of drawings that were developed for low-volume
25 roads defined in Part 5. That seems like a little bit of

1 overkill. But I think we need to go through the item. And
2 I think we know that is something we'll need to discuss but
3 why don't we continue, Don.

4 MR. WANG: May I answer the question of intention
5 real quick?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

7 MR. WANG: The intent was -- first off, last
8 meeting's agenda item, all the chapter mentioned here was
9 stating "all state highways." Since those notes does not
10 apply. And that was highlighted by Mr. Chairman as against
11 the spirit of what we discussed earlier, that excluding
12 other agencies' roadways and only apply those on state
13 highways. So as a solution we looked into where else this
14 is defined. And realizing that every -- elsewhere when a
15 low-volume is designated is used as defined in Part 5,
16 therefore we applied the same logic to the rest of the note
17 where it says state highways only. If that is a concern
18 then Caltrans -- I am speaking for myself, is willing to
19 step back and put it back as a state highway only reference
20 and apply to all low-volume roads.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, your
22 proposal would restore the words "state highway?"

23 MR. WANG: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's a different
25 discussion than defining what a low-volume road is.

1 MR. WANG: Yes, but everywhere that notes is put
2 in it also crosses out the state highway only reference.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, on that
4 one may I make a quick observation?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The whole distinction
7 of a state highway came about when we had the Traffic
8 Manual. That Caltrans was preparing the Manual for its own
9 internal use and no jurisdiction in California was ever
10 obligated to use Traffic Manual. A lot of jurisdictions
11 were using Traffic Manual by default but they were not
12 obligated to use it.

13 Now that we are making it mandatory for all
14 jurisdictions to use CA MUTCD we don't think we can have a
15 distinction between the state highway and any other kind of
16 highway. That distinction should be based on
17 characteristics of roadways not jurisdictional authority.

18 So as a matter of principle I don't think we have
19 to have two different standards, one for a state highway,
20 one for any highway owned by anybody else. Except if you go
21 back to Traffic Manual, which means that this is a Caltrans
22 manual, you guys use it or if you don't like it don't use
23 it. So I don't think that approach is a good one.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I defer to the CHP but
25 my understanding of the CVC is all public roads are

1 highways.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Low-volume road
4 will be --

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Johnny.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, I'm sorry, Johnny.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I
8 want to correct myself. I was just checking the CA MUTCD
9 2010. And basically I think Jeff is right when he is
10 pointing this out because actual definition of crossing it
11 out is something new that was introduced in the 2009 manual
12 so we did not have that crossed out before in the 2010
13 because it did not appear then. So basically what has
14 happened is that in the 2009 manual, since they talked about
15 a low-volume road as shown on the screen, is made by the
16 public agency or official having jurisdiction.

17 So presumably what happened here is when we were
18 working through our workshops and when we looked at this as
19 the definition of whether it's a high-speed or low-volume --
20 high-volume or low-volume. So what has happened is that the
21 feds in the national manual in Part 5, they changed the
22 definition of the low-volume. However, they also added a
23 statement for Part 6 that clearly indicates that they did
24 not indicate Part 6 to be applicable under the low-volume
25 road definition.

1 So when we noticed that, probably in the workshops
2 when we did this, because this was a change in the new
3 manual we struck this out. This stricken out information is
4 new just for the 2012 manual, it wasn't there before. And
5 maybe we might have overlooked it in our workshops when we
6 did that. So I didn't see that. This was a new change. It
7 wasn't something that was there before.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And where is that?
9 Where are we looking at right there, what section?

10 (Committee looking at projected image.)

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can you expand that?
12 Can you enlarge that any more?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What section?

14 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, this is Section 6A.01 and it's
15 on -- let me see.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Paragraph 15.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Paragraph 15. So this paragraph 15
18 language was new in the 2009 national MUTCD. And when we
19 were incorporating it -- so just to be more definitive of
20 really introduced to this term "as defined in Part 5" was
21 struck out by the public agency or official having
22 jurisdiction. So this is some new change that we made.

23 And clearly if we go over the feds, they have --
24 they did change the Part 5 definition of low-volume road.
25 But in paragraph 15 they are clearly trying to indicate that

1 Part 5 is for only Part 5 definition, don't be using it for
2 Part 6. For Part 6 the agency determines what is the high-
3 speed or low-speed -- I mean high-volume or low-volume.

4 And I think in our haste when we were adopting it
5 in our workshop discussions we might have in haste struck
6 this out and said "as defined in Part 5." But what Jeff is
7 pointing out, I think that's a valid concern and certainly
8 we should look into it more carefully.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So why don't we flag
10 this as an item we are going to discuss in a little bit more
11 detail and let Don finish his presentation on the other two
12 items.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. I believe we left
14 off with 6H-11 so the next item will be 6H-15.

15 We are proposing deleting the "Standard" and
16 "Option" words and moving the other paragraphs up. So the
17 Standard language proposed to be deleted: "Note 4 and 5
18 shall not be applicable for state highways. Note 1 shall be
19 used instead for state highways."

20 And then we are adding a "Support" at the bottom
21 of that section, paragraph 11: "This typical application is
22 to be used on low-volume roads as defined by Section 5A.01."

23 And I believe that falls in line with our pending
24 discussion so I will just continue.

25 The next section is Figure 6H-16 and we have added

1 paragraph 13, Support: "This typical application is to be
2 used on low-volume roads as defined by Section 5A.01."
3 Again, consistent with our prior, pending discussion.

4 6H-18, add paragraph 6, Support: "This typical
5 application is to be used on low-volume roads as defined by
6 Section 5A.01."

7 And Figure 6H-26, support -- add a Support section
8 "Note 3 is applied on a low-volume road as defined in
9 Section 5A.01."

10 We have also deleted the prior Standard or the
11 Standard that was there. The Standard and Option that we
12 are deleting states: "Note #3 is not applicable for state
13 highways. Note #1 shall be used instead for state
14 highways."

15 And I believe that is it for that section. Did
16 you want to have that low-volume discussion now?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No, let's go through
18 the last two items on your table.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Finish off the chart?
20 Okay. The next item is Figure 6H-28, which is on page 20.
21 It talks about path width. The pedestrian path width is
22 changed to be consistent with other parts of the CA MUTCD
23 and specifically Section 6D.01.

24 We did note as we were preparing for today's
25 meeting that there was an asterisk included on that hand-

1 edited drawing and we did not see a need for the asterisk.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Can I comment on the
3 figure?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yeah, are there any
5 comments?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, John.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I will be glad to
8 wait until you finish the presentation.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Well for this particular
10 one I think if you had a comment --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I do, a couple of
12 things. First of all, my comments revolve around
13 accessibility. As drawn you have got a detour route in the
14 street using the parking lane that traverses the curb. It's
15 likely that that transition is not accessible for a
16 wheelchair or someone with mobility impairments.

17 So two suggestions. First of all, consider the
18 issue of accessibility. I can see a couple of ways of
19 resolving it. One would be to create some sort of
20 accessible transition, but that might be unreliable as
21 constructed.

22 The second might be to consider moving the barrier
23 so that it spans the entire block and allows the wheelchair
24 user or mobility-impaired user to use the existing curb
25 ramps on the crosswalks to travel into the street and then

1 inside the barrier to the next curb ramp at the subsequent
2 corner.

3 And then third would be to sign a detour-
4 accessible route if it was decided that the route during
5 construction is not accessible whereas the route before
6 construction was. Basically somebody needs to make a
7 decision at the corner that they need an accessible route
8 and they need to decide what to do.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: John, are you
10 referring to the drawing on the left or the drawing on the
11 right?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The drawing on the
13 right. On the drawing on the left it is pretty clear you
14 don't want them on the walk at all, regardless of mobility
15 impairment. They are going to use -- be redirected to the
16 opposite side of the street. On the right, the diversion,
17 there are several accessibility issues.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But there is
19 sufficient width, correct?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah, but width
21 isn't everything you need. The way to think about this is
22 imagine yourself in a wheelchair and what are you going to
23 do. Are you going to cross the curb and drop into the
24 street just before the construction?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: In application they use

1 asphalt and create a smooth transition a lot of times. I
2 have seen this used where they will take them off the
3 sidewalk and then take them out.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I can certainly
5 imagine that if it is properly constructed.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I wanted to point
8 out that there's a couple of other ways of resolving it.
9 One would be to insist the user entering the street have the
10 previous curb ramp if that's accessible and back up onto the
11 sidewalk at the subsequent corner. Which would mean
12 modifying the alignment of the construction barricade or
13 k-rail or whatever, the orange segment.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think --
15 Mr. Chairman?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think the point John
18 brings up is a very good point. But for that, the options
19 that you offered I think, if you want to go -- that's
20 better. Because these drawings, the way that they are drawn
21 can be misleading. The distance between the two
22 intersections could be half a mile so you don't want to get
23 them on the street for half a mile. So maybe if it's a
24 block in the downtown area that's a good solution but for
25 like longer intersections you want to have like the option

1 that Bryan suggested, to have some kind of ramp at that
2 specific location.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think if it was
4 properly constructed that's totally acceptable.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If it is properly
6 constructed. But requiring to have the accessibility
7 continue I think that puts the burden on the agency but
8 gives them also the flexibility to decide cases specific.
9 See what works best for them.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So we could on this path
11 just write "an accessible path."

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

13 MR. WANG: May I respond to John's comment?

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Gordon.

15 MR. WANG: This is Gordon Wang from Caltrans.
16 This particular agenda item is to make minor changes taking
17 care of inconsistencies within the manual.

18 John's comment did come up in my trainings to
19 other local agencies and districts and I see the needs for
20 developing more typicals for pedestrians through work zones.

21 But I haven't -- but that leads to a major policy change
22 rather than what this agenda item is trying to take care.
23 I'm willing to work with Committee Member John to develop
24 more typical applications or more drawings for this
25 particular typical application to address pedestrian detours

1 for through work zones.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I actually liked
3 Bryan's suggestion of just adding the word "accessible."
4 Would that be for the current change acceptable to you?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right now we're just
6 changing it from 36 to 48 inches to be consistent with the
7 ADA regulations most likely, right? And so if we just say
8 48 inches minimum and accessible then it leaves it up to the
9 jurisdiction or the contractor to create an acceptable
10 situation that's accessible for all modes of transportation.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Where would you add
12 the word "accessible?"

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Where it says "48 inches
14 minimum." Just write "and accessible."

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: "Or accessible path"
16 or what?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, "accessible path."

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, if we
19 look at the full language of 6H-28, accessibility features
20 is already in the language in the workbook, you are only
21 seeing a portion of the language. So if you go to the
22 actual workbook for --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: To the notes.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: What page?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Page 1199. It actually

1 says "shall include accessibility features consistent with
2 the features present in the existing pedestrian facility."
3 So if you have got ramps on the corners you have to put in
4 comparable ramps where you are doing the pedestrian detour.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And that's right in the
7 standard.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That satisfies me.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good catch.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
13 question of clarification.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Gordon, you are closer
16 to the ADA standards. I thought the ADA standard is 42
17 inches. Is it 48?

18 MR. WANG: The ADAG is still being finalized at
19 the federal level at this particular moment.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But I thought --

21 MR. WANG: Caltrans is waiting for the final to be
22 published.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Since I have that 42
24 inch in my mind I was wondering what is the significance of
25 the 48 inch, where did that come from?

1 MR. WANG: The 48 inch is to make it consistent
2 with Section 6C.01 of the CA MUTCD.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But it's not an ADA
4 issue, it's a CA MUTCD issue, right?

5 MR. WANG: Yes, that's correct.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay, thanks.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Don, is there
8 one more item?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yeah. The next item is
10 Figure 6H-102(CA). Actually it looks there was a 6H-101
11 also. In 6H-101 we were proposing to remove the Standard
12 paragraph 8, "The minimum offset from the upstream end of
13 the barrier to the edge of the traveled way shall be at
14 least 16 feet unless shielded by a crash cushion."

15 And that is also carried over into 6H-102 on page
16 21, excuse me, page 22. And along with 6H-102 we have also
17 corrected or propose to correct the drawing or the graphic
18 that shows where the bike lane shall be. I'm reading this
19 correctly. The lane line is shifted slightly to the left
20 and cones are added in advance of the protected barrier. Is
21 that correct, Gordon?

22 MR. WANG: No, we are only shifting the lane
23 lines. The orange drawing was by error to depict that the
24 bicycle lane was being part of number two lane. As we all
25 know, bike lane is beside the traffic lane. So we are

1 correcting that error to relocate the bike lane to be
2 between the number two lane and the shoulder.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. And the next item
4 is 6H-105. And that is, again, the definition of the low-
5 volume road. So we are proposing to remove paragraph 10
6 which says: "Notes 6 and 7 shall not be applicable for state
7 highways. Note #1 shall be used instead for state
8 highways." And we are adding a Support paragraph 10: "This
9 typical application is to be used on low-volume roads as
10 defined by Section 5A.01."

11 And that concludes, that concludes the items on
12 that table.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, on which
14 page were the changes on 6H-105?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: 6H-105 was on page 24.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: One question on page
20 23, that's the typical section 102(CA). It's a minor and
21 you're showing it as a -- a crash cushion as optional. But
22 why are we showing a crash cushion and transition on the
23 outer edge of the sidewalk?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Gordon, can you address
25 that?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It shows it as
2 optional but what is -- the outer edge of the sidewalk never
3 needs a crash cushion.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: It's not a sidewalk
5 it's the shoulder.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, the shoulder is --
7 I don't know, the way this is striped I don't know if it's
8 your shoulder. Because you are showing lane lines and then
9 you are showing a bicycle lane so it implies that that
10 outside bicycle lane on the right is the sidewalk.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: It could be the parking
12 lane.

13 MR. BHULLAR: It's a typical drawing. And the
14 reason why the other one is shown optional is if you are
15 within that 15 feet and a bicyclist is using the shoulder,
16 so that needs to be protected, even on the second one.
17 That's the reason. Beyond the 15 then it doesn't need to be
18 so that's the reason for the option.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have no problem with
20 it since you are showing it as optional.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But just looking at it
23 I'm just saying, why do I need a crash cushion on the outer
24 edge of the shoulder.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Well, because if it is a bicyclist

1 -- would be using the shoulder --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No they are not
3 because on the drawing you are showing a bicycle lane.

4 MR. BHULLAR: The bicycle lane is upstream. But
5 when they will be using the shoulder to get into that path
6 that is --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh, to get into the
8 path?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Protected, yes.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

11 MR. BHULLAR: So they will end up on the shoulder
12 before they enter this protected path. And if the second
13 barrier there and the end is within that distance -- we
14 don't know when that lane gets out, if it falls within that
15 or not. That's the reason for option.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because it's optional
17 so they decide whether they need it or not.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Because the bicycles won't be
19 using the left lanes but --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Johnny, comment. It
21 says "crash cushion." The arrow does not point to the crash
22 cushion.

23 MR. BHULLAR: That's a good point. I think we
24 need to make a note of that, Gordon, and make sure we point
25 it to the correct location. Thanks, John.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So the intent here is
2 that even though you have got this Class II bike lane you
3 are actually going to detour the bicycles to the right on to
4 the shoulder. But there is nothing actually that conveys
5 that to the cyclists, right? If I'm riding down here on a
6 bicycle I don't know whether I'm supposed to merge with
7 traffic and be on the left side of the median. There is
8 really nothing telling me that I am supposed to get up on
9 the shoulder and go between those barriers, right?

10 MR. BHULLAR: Well this is a typical application
11 so it doesn't really, I would say, do justice to the way you
12 would really want to do it, meaning that the distances are
13 going to get stretched out. And the signs that are for the
14 bike and the ped detours, they are smaller signs. They will
15 be on the right. And of course the arrows need to be
16 adjusted with the angles as to -- rather than being straight
17 or left. They will mirror close to the geometry out in the
18 field when you are setting them up.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You're saying if this
20 was a detour for a car and we wanted them to shift to the
21 right, we would actually have a detour arrow that -- maybe
22 an S-curve to the right or -- there is just nothing that
23 tells me as a cyclist that I am supposed to go to the right,
24 get onto the shoulder and that that's my designated path,
25 instead of continuing as a kind of a Class II in that little

1 buffer area between what was the number one lane and the
2 barrier. It looks like you have almost left a space for me
3 there as opposed to saying I've got a protected area between
4 those barriers.

5 MR. BHULLAR: You are --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I don't know that I --
7 I think I would be confused as a cyclist trying to figure
8 out where do you want me to go.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Well you are correct in that. And
10 if the figure needs to be improved we can certainly
11 undertake that. But this is the current figure that we had,
12 at least the last time around. The only change we were
13 making was the lane line was in a way showing that the lane
14 number two was almost disappearing and we wanted to shift it
15 toward the left to correct that. But since we had an
16 existing figure -- and I do note and I agree with Jeff's
17 comments. I think there are other things that certainly
18 could be improved in that drawing.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, I agree
20 with what Jeff is saying in that detour sign either needs to
21 be behind that cushion so that it is very clear where you
22 are supposed to go. Because if it is before that cushion it
23 would suggest that, should I be going on the left of that
24 cushion or should I be going on the right of that cushion,
25 and that could be a discrepancy between pedestrians and

1 bicyclists. So if you really want them to share that
2 protected barrier area then it needs to be somewhat between
3 the two cushions or beyond the first cushion.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. This
5 is, I think, a case in point where we needed the new non-
6 motorized team members on the CTCDC a couple of years ago
7 when we were working on these figures. But now that they
8 are here certainly we want to take their input and do want
9 to change these figures so that they meet the needs.
10 Certainly that was lacking a couple of years ago when we
11 worked on these figures.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What was the purpose
13 in shifting the lane line over?

14 MR. BHULLAR: The purpose of shifting the lane
15 line over was, if you look at the -- I'm not sure if it
16 shows up that well. But the lane line was indicating there
17 are still two through lanes but they were not evenly
18 distributed. When you look at -- let's see here.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The bike lane was
20 consuming part of the number two lane.

21 MR. BHULLAR: No, yeah. So up here, the lane line
22 was showing up here. So you had like, like one lane was
23 this wide and the second lane was only like one-third of
24 that width. So we are trying to up here in the north -- but
25 this is where we ended up having the lane line right here.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But you're dropping
2 the lane.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. So basically the two lanes
4 were still being maintained but they were very uneven in the
5 terms of the distribution downstream. But upstream if you
6 look at it, basically they indicated that the bike lane was
7 probably that narrower lane. So that was the confusion.

8 MR. WANG: I need to make a correction to the
9 comment that Johnny provided. The orange no intent is to
10 close the number two lane and put all motor vehicle traffic
11 in number one. And the error occurred down at the bottom
12 portion of the drawing where the lane line is -- the number
13 one lane is showing full width, number two lane is showing
14 full width but half of it taken over by the Class II bike
15 lane.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well are you dropping
17 the general purpose lane or not?

18 MR. WANG: Yes we are.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So if you are
20 dropping the lane why are we shifting the lane line over?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The change in the
22 figure that moves the lane line is not in response to the
23 presence or absence of the lane drop. It's because if you
24 look at the original TA-102 in the California 2012 MUTCD on
25 page --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: 1243.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- 1243, then the
3 bike lane eats up half of the number two travel lane, which
4 is geometrically misleading.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So it's just out of
6 scale.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I thought the bike
8 lane is being diverted between the barriers.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think the issue
10 that they are trying to -- correct me if I'm wrong. The
11 issue that they are trying to correct with the shift of the
12 skip line is that the bike lane was disproportionately large
13 compared to the -- the number two lane was looking like the
14 same width as the bike lane.

15 MR. WANG: On the screen is the current drawing.
16 And the current figure shows the number two lane is much
17 narrower than the number one lane.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I mean, it
19 appears that, if you looked at the workbook, the entire
20 purpose of 6H-102(CA) is to show how to accommodate bicycles
21 when any construction zone is disrupting the Class II bike
22 lane. I mean, that was the purpose of the sheet.

23 And the problem is, regardless of why they are
24 closing the bike lane, the bike lane is being disrupted and
25 it is not clear how we are going to suppose -- how this

1 guides bicycles through the construction zone. And the
2 problem is, who knows what is downstream of what we are
3 seeing here. But once you get on the wrong side of that
4 barrier it is very difficult to get where you intended.

5 So if this was the typical how to handle the
6 disruption in the Class II, this needs to be reworked
7 because this does not adequately guide bicycles through this
8 construction zone. You even need minimum widths there. If
9 you are putting bicycles and pedestrians in the same path
10 between two barriers. I mean, I would think you'd need at
11 least a minimum width between those barriers also if that is
12 the intent.

13 MR. WANG: I completely agree with your comments.
14 And again, that institutes a major policy change. I would
15 like to comment that for the fact we discussed those four
16 typical applications about three years ago during three
17 consecutive meetings and that was the final drawing we
18 arrived at. With some additional help we can certainly
19 improve what we had. Because it was a total of seven
20 typical drawing figures all revised at once and that will be
21 an improvement needed. This particular proposal is just to
22 correct the error and then we will make improvements beyond
23 this point.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Also just to
2 highlight. There is a difference in the engineering manuals
3 between a typical application and the standard drawing.
4 Once you call something typical application the engineer is
5 not obligated to comply. I don't care even if you put the
6 minimum width and you put a minimum number of signs and you
7 put the minimum length. Because these are typical
8 applications.

9 And we all -- those of us who practice engineering
10 know that the minute that you call it a typical application,
11 it is not a standard drawing. If you want to get to the
12 specifics then we have to also consider to not call it a
13 typical application. And then you get into another whole
14 set of issues that once you call it the standard and you
15 make it to mandatory to comply with those minimum width and
16 minimum spacing of the signs and so on and so forth then you
17 have to accommodate for all field conditions.

18 So just to highlight that before we get into a lot
19 of detailed discussions about the details on these drawings.
20 These are typical applications and practitioners are not
21 obligated to comply with them, period. Because they are
22 just showing some suggestions, that's the definition of a
23 typical application.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I did not
25 understand the purpose of the drawing, of the revision when

1 we started this discussion. If I am correct the only
2 purpose in the revision that is before us is to correct a
3 graphical error in the drawing. There is no policy issue
4 involved. To show the lane line such that each general
5 purpose travel lane is of equal width.

6 MR. WANG: That is correct.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Not to sandblast the
8 lane line and shift it over as part of the detour operation,
9 so I misinterpreted the drawing. The drawing -- so that is
10 the only change, there is no policy issue here at all.

11 And I would agree with the comments that maybe a
12 little bit more work could be done to clarify what the
13 pedestrians and bicyclists are to do. But keep in mind,
14 this is an existing drawing. All that is presented before
15 us is to correct a graphical error so there is no real
16 policy issue before us right now. But certainly we could
17 work on this and bring it back to the Committee and improve
18 upon it but this is already an existing drawing, basically.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, there is
20 actually another way to correct the geometric error and it's
21 a question that's raised in my mind. It's about the
22 existence of the bike lane at all on this figure given that
23 it's a closure on a freeway, expressway, rural and urban
24 high-speed location. I question whether a bike lane would
25 be placed on a freeway or expressway or a truly rural high-

1 speed location. So I wonder whether as we consider other
2 revisions to this figure going forward, just omitting the
3 bike lane might be the better approach for this particular
4 figure.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The intent is to show
6 what you do if construction zones interrupt an existing
7 Class II facility. And certainly --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Is that the
9 intention? That's not what the title seems to --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, there's kind of
11 more to it when you read the text in the workbook. The
12 first sentence is "When existing accommodations for bicycle
13 travel are disrupted or closed." So the whole premise is
14 there is a bicycle facility and your construction zone is
15 going to interrupt that facility, what do you do. And this
16 was a typical for how to deal with a disrupted Class II bike
17 lane.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny.

19 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I
20 wanted to offer a little bit of background on when we
21 created these four figures before we start looking at it
22 from scratch.

23 Basically what happened here is that we were
24 working on the Strategic Highway Safety Implementation Plan
25 and out of that what started out was that we needed to have

1 ways or means of addressing, even though we have all the
2 tools in the manual, but since the tools were not being used
3 we wanted to have some typical applications showing the
4 manner in which you would accommodate bicyclists in work
5 zones. And when we looked at that initially there were 20
6 to 30 different types of applications for bike situations.

7 So what I asked of the Committee at that time, not
8 the CTCDC but the SHSIP committee was that we cannot be
9 creating 20 or 25 scenarios just for addressing bicyclists.

10 Why don't you tell us which are your highest type of issues
11 in work zones where we need to address the needs of the
12 bicyclists. So at that time one of the -- when they
13 selected their roadway classification and the criterias,
14 this was one of the scenarios where they said, there is an
15 existing bike lane and that bike lane disappears because
16 that lane is taken out, the right lane is taken out and the
17 bike lane is also taken out.

18 So that was the scenario we were asked to solve
19 and this particular figure does that. Whether we now agree
20 whether the bike lane needs to be on this figure or not is a
21 separate issue because we were addressing just their four
22 highest types of roadways where bicyclists were not being
23 accommodated.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you for that
25 clarification, Johnny.

1 Okay, Don, I think we have gone through all the
2 items on this proposal. And having gone through it my notes
3 tell me that the only area where there was some lingering
4 concern was those added statements that would say "for low-
5 volume road refer to Part 5 of the Manual."

6 And because we spent a lot of time on this I think
7 we just ought to figure out what our options are. If we
8 believe that those should be part of -- related to Part 5 we
9 could keep it as it is. If we feel maybe that maybe we were
10 a little too exuberant in adopting the language in Section
11 6A.01 paragraph 15 that says it's related to Part 5 and not
12 as determined by the local agency, then we would strike
13 those items and revise 6A.01 paragraph 15 if we think that
14 was not the intent to apply Part 5 criteria to these
15 drawings of low-volume roads.

16 I will note that if it does apply to Part 5 we
17 have put in a lot of drawings just for low-volume roads.
18 And again, I don't think that was the intent, in my opinion.

19 But what I would like to do is to focus on this one item;
20 have discussion among the voting members here. And then if
21 Steve from the FHWA, if you have any comments you can make
22 them as part of our discussion of Committee Members. And
23 then after we have kicked it around we'll let the alternate
24 members make any comments and then guests can make any
25 comments.

1 So what is the sense of the Committee on this? Do
2 we want to adopt everything that Don has proposed with maybe
3 a motion on 6A TA-6, 1, 15, 16, 18, 16 and 105?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: At least for me it
7 helps if we frame the issue on the low-volume. What is it
8 we are trying to solve?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Since Mr. Knowles
11 brought it up, you know, what is it?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Basically what was
13 brought up is we -- some feel that these drawings were
14 intended to be applied to local streets and collective
15 streets in suburban and urban areas that -- where we thought
16 the form of control on these types of streets would be
17 appropriate. If we tie it to Part 5 it has to be in a rural
18 area and the AADT cannot exceed 400 per day.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So in all references
20 in Section 6, which are numerous, pretty much at the end of
21 each section Caltrans has added "low-volume as defined by
22 5A.01." Can we just add a clarification for this section
23 by, after comma say "or as defined by the local agency."

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well you can do that
25 by revising Section 6A.01 paragraph 15 to restore the

1 previous language.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But -- okay, yeah.

3 But actually after we define also you have to go back and
4 change 5A.01 also. Because 5A.01 specifically says what
5 low-volume is. So we are saying that in 6A you can have the
6 discretion, either go default language, default definition,
7 or as defined by local. Is that what you're saying?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Part 5 indicates that
9 for purposes of this section a low-volume road is.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Is.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And for purposes of
12 this section. And it says "rural and less than 400 AADT."

13 Part 6A.01 paragraph 15 had previous language
14 where it said for purposes of this section, Part 6, a low-
15 volume road is as determined by the public agency.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So if you go back to
17 that previous language that was stricken out we are going to
18 take care of the problem.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And if we do that and
22 then not include all these proposals to tie it to Part 5.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Not have all those
24 single lines at the end of each section in 6.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. Okay. Is

1 there any motion relating to that?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would move to adopt
3 Caltrans' recommendations except for striking any of the
4 Notes that refer to Section 5A.01 and to go back to the
5 original federal language in Section 6A paragraph 15 which
6 would strike the "as defined in Part 1" which we added and
7 go back completely to the original federal language which
8 included the language "by the public agency or official
9 having jurisdiction."

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I second the motion
11 for discussion purpose.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we have a
13 motion, we have a second. We have had some discussion on
14 it. Are we ready to invite any comments from our alternate
15 members and then from the public? Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: In general I can
17 support the motion being presented. But before a vote is
18 actually taken, after stewing on some of the language that
19 was discussed in Section 6F.101 Loose Gravel I would like to
20 bring that back for just a brief discussion before we vote
21 on the whole package.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: On what page would
23 that be?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Thirteen.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so why don't we

1 discuss that now then, the loose gravel part.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Discussion was made
3 and a proposal was made to make this applicable to all roads
4 with a speed limit of 40 miles or higher, which then applies
5 to prima facie speed limits as well. The issue in certain
6 rural areas where you have roads that do not have a
7 designated speed limit, where the safe speed is far below 35
8 miles an hour, there may be a conflict of suggesting that
9 someone should travel the road faster than what the road is.

10 And I would like to suggest that maybe the speed
11 limit plaque would be 35 miles per hour or lower as a minor
12 amendment to that language. That way it gives a local
13 agency the ability to post an appropriate advisory speed.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So what was proposed
15 is any highway with a speed limit of 40 miles an hour or
16 higher, under your example what would the speed limit be?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: If it hasn't been
18 established by a local agency, meaning it hasn't been
19 codified into --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Then it's 55.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: It's 55.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well then it's 55
23 automatically.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Correct. Then the
25 issue is that the geometrics of the road may not support

1 posting a 35 mile an hour advisory sign. That may be too
2 fast for the conditions of the road. And I am suggesting
3 that the advisory speed should be posted at 35 miles per
4 hour or lower. Then that way it gives local agencies the
5 ability to post an appropriate advisory speed.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand your
7 point because when you are not posting, if you want to issue
8 tickets it's prima facie 55 but still the basic speed law
9 applies, Our CHP rep can talk better about it. The basic
10 speed law is that you cannot drive faster than safe for the
11 existing conditions. But when you give an advisory sign you
12 are actually encouraging them when you say, this is, we
13 think, a safe speed. So 35 might be too high for that
14 condition.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Correct.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so you raise an
17 interesting point. We say the advisory speed plaque shall
18 be used but why in the language do we designate 35 miles an
19 hour?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Again this goes back to
21 the original paragraph where we were referring to state
22 highways. And so on state highways where we do have a
23 higher speed limit generally than 35 miles an hour the
24 recommended highest speed used during chip/seal operations
25 is 35 miles an hour, so that was where that came from.

1 Johnny, do you agree?

2 MR. BHULLAR: What was that? I know it's from the
3 Traffic Manual.

4 MR. WANG: This is Gordon from Caltrans. I agree.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I just think that the
6 comment that was raised can be taken care of by saying 35
7 miles per hour or lower speed as appropriate, it doesn't
8 necessarily need to be 35. So still, you know, it's left up
9 to the state or the local jurisdiction to decide what the
10 advisory plaque is going to be.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I think it gives greater
12 flexibility into a work zone from the conditions of the
13 roadway.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So your concern could
15 be taken care of, let me ask this, if in the -- where it
16 says W13-1 in parentheses says, 35 miles an hour. If after
17 MPH we added the words "or lower."

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Or lower as --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: In parentheses. Would
20 that voice your concern?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Yes it would.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Okay. And let
23 me ask, this was a friendly amendment when we added the
24 language. So Don, would you be willing to consider adding
25 the words "or lower" in the parentheses as a friendly

1 amendment or would you want to have a formal amendment?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: We would accept that as a
3 friendly amendment.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Thank you.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. So we are
7 back to the main issue regarding what is a low-volume road
8 in Part 6. We had a motion, we had a second, we've kind of
9 discussed it. Any comments from anyone sitting in the
10 audience?

11 MR. ROYER: Comments on just that specific one or
12 something else?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Actually you can
14 comment on that or anything else in the presentation for
15 this item. So come on up to the podium.

16 MR. ROYER: Dave Royer, consulting engineer, also
17 University of California. The only comment I have is back
18 on 6F.103 Open Trench sign. On page 14 where we have all
19 the dimensions for posting the signs. Those are certainly
20 appropriate for high-speed, 45 mile an hour or greater
21 highways. Way too much for -- well probably twice as much
22 as you'd want to have on a local residential street or a 35
23 mile an hour street. Having portable delineators 200 feet
24 apart on a street that has a block length of 300 feet is not
25 much delineation.

1 Either kind of cut everything in half -- because
2 that's what we do with the striping pattern. The high-speed
3 striping pattern is basically 50 feet on center, 48
4 actually, low-speed is 24 feet on center for striping
5 patterns. Either reduce everything in half for speeds of 40
6 miles an hour or less or follow the delineation spacing
7 chart. Which I don't have my book with me so I can't
8 remember the spacing chart but we actually have spacing
9 charts based on speed. And that would apply to this and it
10 would apply to any speed because the spacing chart goes from
11 25 to 65 miles an hour, the device spacing chart. That's
12 it.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So Dave, what
14 paragraph or lines would you change?

15 MR. ROYER: Oh, that's the Guidance portion which
16 is -- let's see.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Paragraph --

18 MR. ROYER: Starting in 07 and paragraph 08.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And you would
20 replace ---

21 MR. ROYER: I would either certainly cut that in
22 half for residential streets or maybe you could even just
23 replace the spacing in accordance with the, uh --

24 MR. WANG: Table 6F 101(CA).

25 MR. ROYER: Yeah, Table 6F-101, the device spacing

1 chart based on speed. As an engineer that's what I would do
2 if I was putting these in, I'd go with the spacing chart.
3 So at 25 miles an hour it would be pretty close spacing, at
4 35 it would be a little further. When it got up to 45 it
5 would be a lot further apart and so on.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Caltrans heard
7 that and considers that if they want to change their
8 proposal.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: We would like to change
10 our proposal to incorporate that chart or reference to that
11 chart.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I have a
14 question here. The language that Caltrans is proposing,
15 this not to exceed 2,000 feet for these signs. I don't see
16 any number in the spacing chart that gives you that kind of
17 latitude to go that far apart.

18 MR. WANG: This chart is only for channelizing
19 devices, it's not for signing.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes. So how are we
21 going to address the signing spacing if this is for
22 channelizing devices only? This may take care of the
23 delineator problem but not the signage. So you may need a
24 hybrid of having the 2,000 feet, not to exceed 2,000 feet
25 for signs. But then for delineator, portable delineator as

1 we call them now, refer to Table 6F-101.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any other
3 comments?

4 MR. ROYER: Perhaps on that sign spacing it could
5 be worded something like, you know, the 2,000 feet or no
6 more than -- or at least one sign per city block.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That may solve that
8 problem.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Johnny and then
10 Steve.

11 MR. BHULLAR: I'm Johnny Bhullar. I think we are
12 trying to mix things up here. There are two things, one is
13 the sign issue and the other one is the portable delineator.
14 And of course I do agree, this was a policy that we had
15 previously when we did not have these tables. So of course
16 certainly I am okay with the portable delineator being tied
17 to the channelizer spacing. But for the sign, rather than
18 trying to come up with something new we already have the
19 sign spacing table as well. So why not have the sign
20 spacing with that table. And let me show you what the
21 spacing is on that.

22 MR. WANG: 6H-3.

23 MR. BHULLAR: 6H-3. I have it here. The 6H-3
24 table. So right there. These are the spacings for the --
25 so these are the sign spacings. And probably this is what

1 we should be using then for the signs rather than trying to
2 say what it is for rural. Do you agree, Dave?

3 MR. ROYER: I agree, absolutely.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: This takes care of it,
5 this accommodates that.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

7 MR. WANG: But do we choose A or B or C?

8 MR. BHULLAR: That's the delineation we can make.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So paragraphs 07 and
10 08, paragraphs 07 and 08 need to be changed to make
11 references to the first chart and the second chart.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I think we'd
13 have to have a motion to include the new references to the
14 table. We already have a motion to adopt things but we
15 didn't include this so I think we have to have --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We can amend it, we
17 can amend the motion.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So my sense is
19 that Caltrans would consider this a friendly amendment.
20 Does the maker of the motion agree?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All right.
23 Steve.

24 MR. PYBURN: Hello, Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
25 Administration, the FHWA Coordinator for the MUTCD in

1 California. I have two comments on this motion.

2 First, 6H-6. For consideration, because it's not
3 a standard statement, just the opinion that Note 3 applies
4 to low-volume and low-speed roads, where Chapter 5 may
5 address low-volume roads but they may not necessarily be
6 low-speed. And I agree with the comment that if you apply
7 the requirements of Chapter 5 to low-volume/low-speed road
8 in 6H-6 you are limiting what people in cities and counties
9 can do in suburban areas. The use of the nine foot lane is
10 very useful in those areas where paving may be limited by
11 on-street parking and there's not two full lanes anyway. So
12 that's a comment on that.

13 Regarding 6H-102, speaking not only as the federal
14 representative for the MUTCD but also a bicyclist. I am
15 always concerned when I come up to construction zones on my
16 bicycle. And since this applies to bicyclists, treatment of
17 bicyclists and pedestrians I think the word "freeway" could
18 be deleted from the title since they are precluded from
19 those locations.

20 And it is not clear from the figure that there is
21 a lane being closed. I heard a comment that -- I think
22 Gordon commented that the intent is to close a lane. But
23 then I heard later that there will be two travel lanes so
24 that should be clarified. And that -- if there is not going
25 to be a lane closed, a general purpose lane closed, then how

1 you treat the bicycle lane is extremely important. The
2 figure shows that the barrier between the number two lane
3 and the bicycle lane is optional.

4 Where this figure applies to high-speed facilities
5 that barrier should not be optional. Because as you narrow
6 the general purpose lanes the vehicles in the number two
7 lane will be much closer and then to crowd the bike lane
8 than they will be to crowd the number one lane. And on a
9 high-speed road that puts the bicyclists and pedestrians at
10 much more risk. So clarification of, is that going to close
11 a lane or not. And I would prefer to see the barrier not be
12 optional because it's a high-speed facility. A low-speed
13 facility the barrier being optional is a different issue.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: There is a lane drop
15 sign shown on the drawing.

16 MR. WANG: There is a sign that specifically says
17 "right lane closed ahead."

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The title of the
19 figure is also "Lane Closure."

20 MR. PYBURN: Then -- okay. Again, I was a little
21 confused about the discussion. But assuming that the lane
22 is closed would there be value in the figure to showing the
23 other devices that go along with closing a lane that are
24 represented in other figures of 6H where you are not dealing
25 with the bike issues but you're showing a lane closure for

1 roadwork. There's more signs than this then you would have
2 to close a lane.

3 And then finally the crash cushion. The crash
4 cushion, the optional sign I think should be deleted and
5 that would be the case, that is the case in other figures in
6 the 6H series. And the reason that I believe the word
7 "optional" should be deleted is that puts the practitioner
8 back to the definition of crash cushion and barriers
9 elsewhere in the chapter, this Chapter 6. So it doesn't
10 leave it to -- it leaves it to their discretion to apply the
11 requirements for crash cushions and not leave them off
12 altogether. Thank you.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask one
14 question, Mr. Chairman.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Pyburn?
17 Mr. Pyburn, so you are saying that if you delete "optional"
18 from the figure it gives more flexibility to practitioner?

19 MR. PYBURN: No, what it does, I believe, is it
20 refers the practitioner back to the description of the use
21 of barriers and the use of crash cushions --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So they still
23 decide --

24 MR. PYBURN: -- in other places of Chapter 6.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So they still decide

1 when it's appropriate to put it there.

2 MR. PYBURN: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You say they still
5 decide. Then does it remain an option?

6 MR. PYBURN: Per the other portions of Chapter 6,
7 it refers back to the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide. So the
8 Design Guide might lead the practitioner to say it is
9 required there, which would then be in a conflict with a
10 design that says "optional" in the figure. The word
11 "optional" is not in other 6H figures with the crash
12 cushion.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I see your point. So
14 you're saying by keeping the optional there we are
15 superseding other design guidelines such as AASHTO.

16 MR. PYBURN: It could be interpreted that way.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You said "optional."
18 Even though AASHTO requires it I decided not to put it in.

19 MR. PYBURN: That's right.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you.
21 Gordon.

22 MR. WANG: This is Gordon from Caltrans. I would
23 like to point out, the figure says "the use of temporary
24 traffic areas should be based on engineering judgment."

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, having heard

1 those comments do we want to make any more revisions to the
2 proposal?

3 Okay, I hear none. So we have a motion. As I
4 understand it the motion is to adopt all the items that Don
5 presented with some modifications on page -- the first one
6 that would be on page 13, Standard paragraph 06. That would
7 replace state highways -- the sentence would read, paragraph
8 06 Standard: "On highways with speed limits of 40 miles an
9 hour or higher for chip seal projects, the W13-1 (35 mph or
10 lower) plaque shall be used to supplement the W8-7 sign
11 during placement and/or brooming of screenings."

12 And then on page 14 under Guidance paragraph 06,
13 the end of the sentence would be changed from "for above
14 condition" to read "per the condition described above."

15 And then paragraph 07 I don't have the exact
16 language. But instead of having the 2,000 limit for -- we'd
17 have to refer to -- the intent is to editorially change it
18 to instead of having a specific interval limit to refer to,
19 I think it's Table 6H-3 and Table 6F-101(CA) for the spacing
20 of the signs and of the portable delineators.

21 MR. WANG: That is correct.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So --

23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Paragraph 03 on that page.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Paragraph 03 on page
25 what?

1 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Fourteen.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Fourteen.

3 MR. WANG: The same table reference would be
4 recommended throughout the entire section.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, good catch. We
6 would revise paragraph 03 on page 14 accordingly. And we
7 would strike all reference to Section 5 as how to determine
8 a low-volume road. So that is the --

9 R COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And restore the federal
10 language?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And restore the
12 federal language to Part 6A.01 paragraph 15. Did we get it
13 all?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You got it all.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So that is the motion
16 before us. Does everyone understand the motion? Okay, we
17 will take it to a vote. All of those in favor raise your
18 hands.

19 (Show of hands.)

20 Two, three, four, five, six --

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Unanimous.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- seven, eight, nine,
23 ten. Unanimous, thank you.

24 At this point I would like to take a ten minute
25 break. (Laughter.)

1 MR. WANG: Before we go on a break I have one more
2 question. We are striking out all the Section 5A.01
3 reference, it also means we are restoring all the reference
4 to state highways at this time, correct?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No, we did not adopt
6 that.

7 MR. WANG: So we still strike out everything that
8 has a standard that says "state highways?" That is current
9 language right now.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes, we are continuing to
11 strike out the reference to state highways as was agreed and
12 we are modifying what the description of a low-speed road
13 is. Or -- yeah, a low-volume/low-speed road. I believe
14 that was the proposal.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The difficulty from our
16 perspective as a city is all of my public streets are state
17 highways by the vehicle code. So if you try to set a
18 standard just for state highways, that's every public street
19 in the state.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That would be an
21 interesting debate.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean, there's a
23 difference between a freeway or a state route and calling it
24 a public highway. I mean, it's the highways code and it
25 applies to all of our public streets, doesn't it?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: It's a highway, yes. You
2 were saying "state highway" though. I don't know if
3 that's --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But, I mean, if you
5 look at the definition of a highway in the vehicle code,
6 it's any public facility -- I don't know, travel way
7 maintained with public funds.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think when the
9 language state highway has -- where it appears in this
10 manual, where it appeared in the past, it's capital S,
11 capital H. I think they were referring to a highway
12 maintained and operated by Caltrans.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And they go back to
14 Traffic Manual. That was an internal Caltrans document.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The motion has passed,
16 you want to stop this.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, all right.
18 There was a clarification required and I think we clarified
19 it. So we'll go on a ten minute break and go back to Item
20 12-1 upon our return.

21 (Off the record at 11:20 a.m.)

22 (On the record at 11:36 a.m.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, let's resume the
24 meeting. We are going back to Item 12-1. That's a Caltrans
25 item, Don.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes, thank you. This is
2 a proposal to amend section 2I.03 to clarify local
3 responsibility in the establishment of STAA truck routes.
4 The proposal begins on page five.

5 And basically existing language in the MUTCD
6 requires that the local agencies inform the Department in
7 writing that local roads and intersections meet geometric
8 criteria for STAA routes. The purpose of this language is
9 to reduce the need for Department staff to analyze roads for
10 STAA access and to make sure that the local agencies concur
11 and approve of those routes. However, some confusion still
12 exists regarding the separate roles of the local and state
13 agencies when analyzing these routes and so we're proposing
14 these changes to better clarify what each person or each
15 group's responsibility is.

16 One major area that was discussed last time and
17 created a little bit of controversy dealt with the multiple
18 jurisdictions. And basically we are trying to clarify that
19 as well. That if the proposed STAA route goes through more
20 than one local jurisdiction then the local jurisdiction
21 applying for the route must obtain concurrence from the
22 adjacent jurisdictions. And that only makes sense so that
23 the truck does have a continuous route and that all the
24 jurisdictions involved have agreed to that.

25 As far as the actual proposal goes. Everywhere

1 that the word "highways" had been shown previously we have
2 changed that to "routes."

3 Getting more into the actual work on page seven
4 dealing with STAA Truck Service (G66-55(CA) Sign. In
5 paragraph, under paragraph 58, Section 3, Concurrence. We
6 have modified the word "jurisdiction(s)" -- or removed it, I
7 should say, and replaced it with agency(ies).

8 We have added -- on page eight at the top we have
9 added a reference to paragraph 6D-2(D) with regard to
10 geometric criteria.

11 We have also better designated the National
12 Network and the Terminal Access routes under Standard
13 paragraph 60, the last bullet.

14 We have also added under the Standard, paragraph
15 60, Section 2, the first bullet that deals with signing from
16 the state highway will be done by the Department. And then
17 it lists various criteria and I will read through those
18 criteria. A -- well let me just start from the beginning of
19 that section because that's where the meat of the changes
20 are and that will be of most interest to the Committee
21 Members and our guests.

22 Standard, number 2, on local highways -- excuse
23 me. "On Local Routes: Signing of egress from a State
24 Terminal Access route to a local Terminal Access route shall
25 be done by the Department only if:

1 "a) the local agency has requested that the
2 Department place the sign, and

3 "b) the local agency has informed the Department
4 in writing that the local roads and intersections on the
5 proposed local Terminal Access route meet all geometric
6 criteria for STAA trucks, and

7 "c) if the proposed Terminal Access route passes
8 through more than one local jurisdiction, each affected
9 agency has informed the Department in writing that the local
10 roads and intersections on the proposed local Terminal
11 Access route meet all geometric criteria for STAA trucks,
12 and

13 "d) the Department has verified that the state
14 highway ramps or intersections meetings all geometric
15 criteria for STAA trucks.

16 Throughout this section there have been several
17 asterisks. The asterisks refer to the following:

18 "The geometric criteria involve using the
19 STAA design vehicle to design or analyze the
20 intersection ramp or curve so that the STAA
21 vehicle can stay in its lane without encroaching
22 into the adjacent or opposing lane (for more
23 guidance on geometric criteria, see Topic 404 in
24 the Caltrans Highway Design Manual) and, if the
25 Terminal Access route ends without connecting to

1 another STAA route, ensuring that an adequate
2 turnaround location is available for all STAA
3 vehicles 24 hours per day, 7 days per week."

4 The next bullet has been amended in such a way
5 that much of it has been deleted. Actually all of it has
6 been deleted. I will not read the deletion. The following
7 bullet we have added information.

8 "After steps a) through d) have been
9 completed in Item 2 'On Local Routes,' the local
10 agency or agencies shall place G66-45(CA) signs at
11 every critical decision point on the Terminal
12 Access route in their respective jurisdictions,
13 including a G66-56(CA) sign with END Auxiliary
14 (M4-6) signs at the 24 hour turnaround location
15 where the Terminal Access route ends if it does
16 not connect to another STAA route."

17 The last bullet:

18 "After the local agency or agencies have
19 placed all the required signs on the local
20 Terminal Access routes, the Department shall place
21 G66-56(CA) sign on the State route in advance of
22 the ramp or intersection to the local Terminal
23 Access route."

24 That's the proposal. We do have Casey Robb with
25 us here today from the Truck Size & Weight branch from

1 Caltrans. If there are any general comments or questions
2 about this I can answer those. If there are any detailed
3 questions I will refer those to Casey.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Don, I have an edit
5 suggestion or else I can save it for later if that's
6 appropriate.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I think we're, I think
8 we're through with the presentation.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So, John.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The edit suggestion
11 is, I note that of the four A, B, C, D clauses under 2 On
12 Local Routes, the only one that begins with an "it"
13 conditional is Clause C. And I wonder if it would be
14 clearer, because C ends with the word "and." It is not
15 clear whether that "and" links clauses C and D together or
16 just -- or whether D is applicable in any event. One way to
17 resolve that would be to move up D to become the new C and
18 make C be D so that the "if" conditional is only applicable
19 to the very last of the four clauses.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I make a comment
21 on that, John?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Absolutely.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: At the beginning, the
25 intro paragraph it says "only if." The minute they put

1 "only if" and then they put the last one with "and" I think
2 if I am reading the Manual it means to me that all the four
3 conditions must be met concurrently. That lack of either
4 one is not going to qualify because they say "only if."

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Was that the intent,
6 Don?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Well, the intent, the
8 intent is if it's a single jurisdiction, A, B and D would
9 have to be met. Obviously if it doesn't go through multiple
10 jurisdictions there wouldn't be a need for C.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Hamid, I do see that
13 "and" terminates all four of the -- all three of the --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The minute you say
15 "only if" and instead of "or" you put "and" it means all
16 four conditions must be met.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: My question, Chairman, is
19 that the truck has to stay in its own lane and it can't
20 encroach into an adjacent lane. And many of our truck
21 drivers when they are making right turns will block the
22 adjacent through lane so that they don't take out or traffic
23 signal poles. If we have to put in all of our right turn
24 pockets so that a truck never has to do that then why do
25 they have a sign on the back of them that says "we make wide

1 turns." So operational-wise they are already going to do
2 something a little different. And a lot of our
3 intersections are not designed so that a large semi-truck
4 cannot stay within its existing lane to make a maneuver
5 through an intersection.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Can you tell me what
7 section you're pointing to or --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: It's Section D. it says
9 that we have to show that it can stay in its lane without
10 encroaching into an adjacent or opposing lane. And I could
11 understand an opposing lane, even though on some of our
12 smaller roadways they might have to encroach in an opposing
13 lane for a short period of time. And our semi-trucks do
14 that on a regular basis on our operating -- just how they
15 operate their vehicles. And as long as they're doing it in
16 a safe manner then that's their engineering -- that's their
17 driving judgment on their vehicles. But I'm not sure that
18 we can -- some of our semi-truck vehicles can't stay in
19 their own lane at all times.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Bryan, the beginning
21 of that, letter D says the Department has verified that the
22 State highway ramp or intersection meets all geometric
23 criteria. So I wonder if it isn't limited to something
24 under the Department's control rather than impacting the
25 local agency.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: No, it is not limited
2 just to the Department, it is also for the local
3 jurisdictions as well. Casey Robb, could you come up to the
4 microphone for a second to address the original question
5 about adjacent versus opposing. I think we all understand
6 opposing but I think what Bryan was suggesting was that even
7 non-STAA trucks sometimes would encroach upon the adjacent
8 lane in order to get into driveways or things like that. So
9 if you could just address how that fits into this
10 requirement.

11 MS. ROBB: Casey Robb from Caltrans, Office of
12 Truck Services. There are a whole, long list of criteria
13 for STAA trucks to pass, to be considered passing and those
14 are in the Highway Design Manual. They are pretty long and
15 we would not be able to list them all here, which is why I
16 refer to the Design Manual.

17 The basic idea is that they stay in their lane but
18 they are allowed to use the shoulder. They are not allowed
19 to go off the pavement. There are times, for example at
20 intersections, when they have to go out of their lane. We
21 could strike "adjacent" here but the basic idea is that they
22 would stay in their lane. But when you start reading all
23 the fine print you're going to have to go to the Highway
24 Design Manual.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

1 MS. ROBB: You've got the bike lanes and there are
2 all kinds of issues that are covered there that we can't
3 really summarize here too well.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I just know that our ped
5 heads get taken out by semi-trucks, our traffic signal poles
6 get taken out by semi-trucks. And they have a sign on the
7 back of them that says "we make wide turns" and the diagram
8 on the back of the truck says that they are making multiple
9 lanes to make a maneuver, so.

10 MS. ROBB: But I would hope that anyone going by
11 this would not just read the MUTCD, they would also go to
12 the Design Manual because that's really the authority.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

14 MS. ROBB: This is more like just a brief summary.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: This is only if you
19 want to sign it as a truck route. Just because you don't
20 sign it you cannot restrict trucks if they have legitimate
21 business, if they have a legitimate delivery. Not the
22 state, the federal law allows them pretty much to go
23 anywhere. So just because you don't sign them it doesn't
24 mean they cannot go there.

25 It's when you want to take it off the interstate

1 system and take them through your city or somewhere where
2 they don't have a legitimate delivery destination, they want
3 to go through your city to get to the next jurisdiction,
4 that's when it applies. Otherwise, pretty much any size
5 truck can access anywhere. That's why you see those huge
6 Mayflower delivery trucks on residential streets, because
7 people are moving. So that's when they start taking out the
8 poles and all that stuff.

9 MS. ROBB: The household goods movers have a
10 federal and state exemption, they can go where they want to.

11 But the STAA trucks have to stay on the interstates and
12 certain Terminal Access routes that the state has approved
13 or they cannot travel there.

14 Now the federal law says reasonable access. But
15 what a truck driver considers reasonable and what the state
16 engineer considers reasonable may be two different things.
17 But it's really the state engineer that determines what is
18 reasonable by their geometric analysis. And if there is no
19 sign there then they can be cited and put out of service by
20 CHP.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If they don't have a
22 legitimate delivery business. If they have a legitimate
23 delivery business, even if they are not on the state or city
24 designated state route -- because at some point they need to
25 get off the designated route to get to their legitimate

1 delivery point. So then it becomes the judgment of the
2 officer in the field whether he was using the shortest and
3 most direct route or whatever.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Well, if they're -- once
5 they're off the STAA route, if they're a vehicle that's
6 governed by the length requirements they can't be on the
7 other roads unless, like she said, if they're a household
8 mover. Other than that they can't be on the streets.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I know our police
10 department enforces -- we have roads that are not truck
11 routes and some truck drivers use them as shortcuts and our
12 CHP -- our police department will cite them for being off of
13 a truck route if they are not delivering something on that
14 roadway.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That is the intent of
16 this section.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Casey, maybe you could
18 explain what an STAA truck route is versus just standard
19 truck routes that we have on our streets out in the West.

20 MS. ROBB: The basic size truck in California is
21 called California Legal; it's a maximum 65 feet overall
22 length. And that size truck can go virtually anywhere in
23 California. Not necessarily on local roads because a lot of
24 the local governments will have designated truck routes and
25 weight limits on other streets. But that's the standard

1 size for California. There are a few state routes where
2 they can't go but most of them they can.

3 Then there is the STAA truck which has unlimited
4 overall length. And they're getting longer and longer
5 because the truck tractors are like, you know, hotel rooms
6 on wheels in some cases, they're really long. But we cannot
7 put a maximum length on those. So they go on the interstate
8 and certain state routes where they're allowed. So it's a
9 little different from the California Legal network.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And how long typically
11 are the STAA trucks?

12 MS. ROBB: They used to be about 67 to 70 feet,
13 now we're getting them 80 feet, 82 feet long.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

15 MS. ROBB: In a few cases the truck tractor could
16 be 30 feet long on its wheelbase.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you for that
18 clarification. Okay, any --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: just a second. For
20 further clarification, that's another reason why we refer to
21 the STAA design vehicle for our calculations because there
22 is such a wide variety of vehicles that qualify as STAA,
23 right, Casey?

24 MS. ROBB: Yes. And we recently changed the
25 design vehicle. For years it was a 20 foot wheelbase truck

1 tractor. And we discovered with our data collecting that
2 this was no longer adequate to cover most of them. So we
3 just recently changed that wheelbase to 23 feet, which puts
4 the overall length at -- I'm not sure, I have to look, but
5 it might be something like 72.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And Casey, do these
7 only connect with a major terminal area?

8 MS. ROBB: The original idea was that the trucks
9 would only be going to terminals. But now the understanding
10 of terminal is any destination. So any time that a trucker
11 wants to apply for a Terminal Access route, as long as they
12 have a destination they want to get to there, even if it's a
13 mom and pop business, that's considered a terminal, they can
14 apply. And if they fit then they can -- the route can be
15 approved. But they do have to fit. They can't run off the
16 pavement or cross the center line.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So what if you can
18 find no route that fits all these geometric criteria? Then
19 what do they do to get to their terminal?

20 MS. ROBB: Well, in the 1980s the state looked at
21 the whole network of highways and allowed the STAA trucks
22 anywhere where they fit. At this point it's mostly the
23 local roads that are being opened up because the local
24 governments didn't do that systematically like we did. So
25 they usually apply. We get involved because Caltrans has to

1 look at the ramps. If they fit on the local road then the
2 law says that you have to let them. You can't say no
3 because of noise and, you know, other concerns.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But what I'm
5 getting at is if we have changed the understanding of what a
6 terminal is and they are now going to more local
7 destinations, is it then feasible to preclude them from
8 using an adjacent lane or an opposing lane for some tight
9 turn that may exist at an older, urbanized intersection?

10 MS. ROBB: The local government can only say no on
11 the basis of safety and an engineering analysis. And if
12 they are crossing the center line that is on the basis of
13 safety.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Then what is the
15 recourse for the truck to get to its terminal?

16 MS. ROBB: Get a shorter tractor and be 65 feet or
17 less, California Legal.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Or they can apply for
20 a special permit. They can apply for a special permit with
21 pilot cars and having a -- the local jurisdictions can even
22 ask for a police escort and all that.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, we have done that
24 before.

25 MS. ROBB: I --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Just like we did --

2 MS. ROBB: I'm sorry.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well just like we did
4 for that big rock that was moved from Riverside County to
5 the LA Museum.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You see them all the
7 time when people are moving houses. The house movers, they
8 always -- they are not going to fit any of these
9 requirements so the house movers always ask for a special
10 permit when they're moving structures.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Let's not confuse permit
12 loads with STAA trucks, they're two totally separate things.
13 A permit load would only be issued a permit if it's a non-
14 reducible load.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: So like the big rock. If
17 they had broken it into gravel they could take it anywhere
18 and wouldn't need a permit. But then you wouldn't have a
19 big rock at the end. So that's why it gets a permit. But
20 just to make sure we're not confusing things, permits are
21 totally separate and not part of today's discussion.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. Any
23 further discussion among members of the Committee?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: In thinking about
2 paragraph D and understanding that all of these conditions
3 have to be met, I think we need to make sure that it's
4 clear, especially as it relates to local agencies, what the
5 requirements are here.

6 Because I agree with Bryan that in certain
7 situations where the terminal is in the local area we can't
8 design our curb returns to accept something over a standard
9 Caltrans length. Understanding that the STAA trucks are now
10 going to be going over there I have a little concern about
11 including the adjacent part of the adjacent or opposing
12 lane. And also I would recommend that we consider removal
13 of the state designation for the state highway ramp,
14 recognizing that we are looking at local terminations as
15 well, or terminals as well.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is that a motion?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: With the removal of
18 "adjacent" and removal of "State" I would move that we go
19 ahead and approve.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Removal of "adjacent
21 or?"

22 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: "Adjacent or."

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And where does the
24 word "State" appear?

25 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: At the top of the

1 paragraph.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Before we make any
3 motions, Casey, could I have you just kind of weigh in if
4 that would materially affect what you are trying to say
5 here?

6 MS. ROBB: If we could break that into the two
7 pieces here. The first one of removing "adjacent." That
8 would be okay as long as they look at the Highway Design
9 Manual for the big picture.

10 We might want to put in something like "stays on
11 the pavement." Because if you just have "opposing lane" it
12 almost sounds like they can go anywhere as long as they
13 don't cross the center line. You might want to just say
14 "stay on the pavement and not cross into the opposing lane."

15 But hopefully they'll go to the Design Manual and read
16 further.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: What about "State" in the
18 first sentence of the -- the "State" referred to something
19 that the state is doing or owns or is that an over-arching
20 statement?

21 MS. ROBB: Can someone read the statement with the
22 word "State" removed?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'll read it. "D) the
24 Department has verified that the highway ramp or
25 intersection meets all geometric criteria for STAA trucks."

1 MS. ROBB: Would that then include local
2 intersections?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Well that's what I am
4 asking you, Casey. This is, you know, something that was
5 part of the original proposal so I'm just trying to
6 understand. I can see how it could be intended to mean that
7 it encompasses both the state highway system and the
8 verification of the local roadways as well.

9 MS. ROBB: Our main purpose here is that Caltrans
10 staff not evaluate local intersections, so that would remove
11 the purpose of the changes here.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I
13 ask a question here?

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On the policy
16 question. Hypothetical. And it may happen a lot because
17 I'm thinking like downtown LA, downtown San Francisco, a lot
18 of places. There is no way in the world that they are going
19 to meet the STAA requirements at all the intersections. And
20 if the locals decide for any reason, I can't possibly even
21 speculate.

22 But if the locals decide that they want to request
23 a sign to allow trucks to get off at that exit and within
24 the state boundary on the ramps and intersections that are
25 under your control you meet the STAA requirements. If they

1 don't meet the STAA requirements all the way throughout the
2 route, if they accept responsibility why would Caltrans have
3 any problem with that? Why is that they have to say that
4 all the intersections and all the routes meet all these
5 requirements?

6 Because the minute you let them off the interstate
7 system they are on a local street. And if the local street
8 comes to you and says that yeah, we want to establish from
9 Point A to Point B as an established STAA truck route. But
10 one of our intersections doesn't meet all the requirements
11 but we have larger considerations that we want to establish
12 this route for, they have a huge employer here who is hiring
13 10,000 people and they say they need to have truck access.
14 I am just hypothesizing. And they accept the
15 responsibility, why would you mandate that they meet all,
16 all the route, throughout the route they meet STAA
17 requirements?

18 MS. ROBB: If you look at B, 2-B. The blue text
19 was existing language from previous MUTCDs.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand. But now
21 since this item is up and we are discussing it, I can't.
22 I'm looking at the representatives from the cities and the
23 counties if they want to have some flexibility that in case
24 there is a specific case. If they are held up to this and
25 one of their intersections does not meet the STAA

1 requirement do you want to at least give them some
2 flexibility that if they want to deviate from this?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I know in our village
4 area in Carlsbad there are intersections that a semi-truck
5 cannot stay out of opposing lanes when they are making a
6 right turn because the intersection is so small. So when
7 they are making a right turn they wait for that. They
8 either get somebody out there to stop traffic or flag it so
9 that they can make it. But they have to when they are
10 making deliveries to some of our businesses in the village
11 area, they can't stay in either their adjacent lane or out
12 of opposing lanes. And it happens quite frequently for our
13 commerce in our village area.

14 Now on our bigger suburban roadways that are six
15 lanes, yeah, they're wide enough that the semis can do it
16 and they can use adjacent lanes. But where we have two lane
17 roadways that have been in existence since 1920 and historic
18 buildings up against them, we are never going to be able to
19 accommodate a semi-truck staying in their adjacent or out of
20 their opposing lanes.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: If I could just say
22 something quick, John. Let's please stay focused on the
23 STAA vehicles. That's what this section is about. We are
24 not saying that this is banning trucks anywhere. There are
25 always going to be trucks that need to do commerce in your

1 cities and your counties. We are simply saying that the
2 size of these vehicles, which is preordained by the federal
3 government; right, Casey?

4 MS. ROBB: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: The STAA vehicle.

6 MS. ROBB: On the interstates, yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. That we are trying
8 to provide information to that truck driver. We are trying
9 to guide him on a route where he is not going to end up
10 stuck. Where he is not going to have to call law
11 enforcement to come out and help him back up for two miles
12 or something because he can't turn around.

13 We are not trying to stifle commerce in any way.
14 We are simply trying to provide accurate guide signs for the
15 truck driver so that he can make an intelligent decision.
16 And we are relying on the local agencies to assist in
17 helping us get that guy to where his load needs to go.
18 Helping us, meaning Caltrans. So we are more than happy to
19 put up the signs on our ramps to provide Terminal Access
20 route identification. And do we still do the service signs
21 as well, Casey?

22 MS. ROBB: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. And service as
24 well, even though I am not sure why that is not covered
25 here. But if a person knows that they are going down to the

1 center city they will normally use a smaller vehicle to get
2 there because they don't want to get stuck. The more time
3 they spend waiting to get assistance to get out of somewhere
4 is time and money lost, we all understand that. So if we
5 focus the questions on the STAA trucks, which are the super
6 trucks, the big trucks, then I think, you know, we're on the
7 right path. But if we sidetrack to just any semi or any big
8 truck, or any truck I should say, we're kind of losing
9 focus.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand that and
12 that was my concern exactly. Imagine, say, the city of Seal
13 Beach and there is a Boeing plant there. And Boeing makes
14 parts that they may have to deliver for a space shuttle
15 assembly to Florida. And the city of Seal Beach needs to
16 have access from interstate to the Boeing plant. But not
17 all the intersections along that route meet the STAA
18 requirement. If the city of Seal Beach goes to Caltrans
19 District 12 and says, we take full responsibility, and
20 District 12 goes to the Manual and says, no, you must meet
21 all the STAA geometric requirements all along the route
22 before we can designate the ramp as an STAA off-ramp --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Well --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What I'm saying, what
25 I'm saying is that if you afford some language in here that

1 says that locals can on specific cases -- because this thing
2 is going to be published. And then when locals are going to
3 go to districts and ask for the truck route signs, the
4 district is going to read this and then they say, no, there
5 is no room for deviation. All the intersections must meet
6 all the geometric requirements.

7 So if the local wants to take responsibility for
8 one or two intersections that don't fully meet the STAA
9 requirements but they have larger business interests, as in
10 the case of Seal Beach and the Boeing plant, then I think
11 it's good to give them that flexibility, that's all I'm
12 saying.

13 MS. ROBB: I am not an attorney but my
14 understanding is that Caltrans could be liable if they put a
15 sign up. There is some concern among some engineers that
16 Caltrans could still be liable if they put a sign up on your
17 state highway saying this is a STAA route and then they get
18 into an accident. We just want to be sure that it's clear
19 that it's the local government that takes the
20 responsibility. Also I want to point out again that this is
21 blue text. Certainly we can discuss it here but this is not
22 what we are proposing right now, this is already -- it has a
23 precedence already.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: I would like to point
25 out because it seems very clear. Section B is a part where

1 the local agencies make their determination for their roads.
2 Part D is for the state, Caltrans, to make the
3 determination for their facilities. Everyone is coming to
4 the table with their part.

5 It seems that the only issue might be, where there
6 is a little bit of confusion, is at a freeway off-ramp where
7 Caltrans physically owns the right-of-way where an
8 intersection is, where a local agency has been transferred
9 maintenance responsibilities for the road that crosses over
10 the highway and specifically designating who is going to
11 take the lead on analyzing that very first intersection.

12 MS. ROBB: To my knowledge it has always been
13 Caltrans if it's within the Caltrans right-of-way. This is
14 routine among the district engineers, they do this
15 routinely.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: And I am certain that if
17 this were elevated that Caltrans would do it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any further
19 discussion on the STAA matter among Voting Members?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just wanted to note
21 that when the policy first came out it just seemed like the
22 responsibility was all being shifted to the local agencies.

23 It was just a terrible when this arrived in the mail when I
24 first saw it. And so what I am staying focused on, at least
25 in this discussion, is that I think that the red text

1 actually improves the policy from a local agency standpoint;
2 I wish the whole thing would just go away.

3 But since the blue text already exists, I do
4 appreciate the amendments that have been made because I
5 think it is more reasonable now than it had been. It's less
6 bad so I do appreciate the changes. (Laughter.)

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Less bad is good.

8 MS. ROBB: I believe that the local governments
9 have always been responsible for the roads but this
10 clarifies that fact. And local governments, I believe,
11 would probably support this for that reason.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: These changes, yes.

13 MS. ROBB: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: With that in mind and in
18 the spirit of cooperation and making steps to improve, which
19 I think this does and I agree with you Jeff, I'm going to --
20 I will rescind my motion to make those changes. I think it
21 does add something, though, to -- did we agree that we would
22 move D to C and C to D? We did not? I see the value in
23 that now.

24 Because here is what I am looking at. B deals
25 with local agencies, D really deals with Caltrans. If we

1 stick D up to C then we're dealing with the agency has
2 requested then we're dealing with B, the local agency, then
3 the state and then C becomes D, which is the terminal, the
4 proposed access. So I see value in flip-flopping those just
5 for purposes of clarifying B is the local agency and C is
6 the state.

7 MS. ROBB: Can I say something about that? I kind
8 of struggled with some of the wording because I wanted it to
9 be clear. It was kind of hard to get everything out there.
10 But I put B and C together because they both have to do
11 with the local agencies informing the Department. The fact
12 that it starts with the word "if" was very awkward and I
13 worked with that and I couldn't seem to find a good solution
14 to that. But these are all requirements so there should be
15 "and" after each paragraph. And we could -- we could switch
16 C and D but then the local agency --

17 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Those two get pulled
18 apart.

19 MS. ROBB: Yes, they get pulled apart.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Or you could go to A,
21 D, B and C.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: That would work.

23 MS. ROBB: That would work as long as Caltrans
24 didn't feel like they had to do their part first. Because
25 if there's a problem with local government Caltrans would

1 have to do the work to evaluate when maybe it's not
2 necessary.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I had a question
4 about the first sentence of D. It says "the State highway
5 ramp or intersection." Is that -- is there always only one?
6 I'm not quite understanding why it says "the State highway
7 ramp or intersection." It's a lack of understanding of the
8 whole concept.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Maybe you meant to say
10 plural. Because if you're going eastbound on the interstate
11 you get off at this intersection, if you're going westbound
12 you get off at that intersection.

13 MS. ROBB: That's right.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you probably meant
15 it to be in the plural.

16 MS. ROBB: I agree, it should be plural because
17 sometimes there are as many as eight ramps to consider.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So the editorial
19 change would be "State highway ramps or intersections meet"
20 is that correct?

21 MS. ROBB: Usually there's only one intersection
22 but multiple ramps. But if we put an S on "intersection"
23 too it would cover everything.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Then did we have an
25 amendment on the table to strike the word "adjacent or" in

1 the asterisked passage about the geometric criteria?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: No, Mr. Chairman. John,
3 we agreed in the spirit of cooperation and because this is
4 an improvement to go ahead and leave that in, understanding
5 that that paragraph is talking about state facilities..

6 MS. ROBB: Actually it's the definition of
7 geometric criteria, which probably should have been pulled
8 down under D because it doesn't really go with D. There are
9 about three different asterisks that go to that definition.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: There just needs to
11 be some white space.

12 MS. ROBB: Yes.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any further
14 discussion among voting members?

15 MS. ROBB: So can I say something then?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Casey.

17 MS. ROBB: So if the geometric criteria definition
18 should not apply to the local roads maybe we should bring
19 that up now.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I don't think we need to
21 bring that up now.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I could simply say that
23 the local agency has a responsibility for confirming that
24 their facilities are acceptable for putting that on. If
25 they're not, if there was concern about that then there

1 wouldn't be any confirmation. So that takes care of it
2 right there.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, are we ready to
4 -- yes, Roberta.

5 MS. McLAUGHLIN: This double "if" is really
6 bugging me. So I am suggesting changing the "if" in
7 paragraph C to the word "when." "When the proposed Terminal
8 Access route passes through more than one local jurisdiction
9 the agency has informed --" blah-blah-blah-blah. Does that
10 seem reasonable?

11 MS. ROBB: It's "when" or possibly "where." you
12 could try that.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I would say "where."

14 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Where.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can you read the whole
16 sentence?

17 MS. McLAUGHLIN: So if you were to go to the first
18 part of that Section 2 you would have to start with that
19 first sentence: "Signing of egress from a State Terminal
20 Access route to a local Terminal Access Route shall be done
21 by the Department only if:"

22 But when you continue that with paragraph C you
23 have two ifs, the "only if" and the "if" following again.
24 So what we are saying is that second "if," the first word in
25 paragraph C be changed to the word "where." So it would

1 read, starting back at the top, "shall be done by the
2 Department only if: C, where the proposed Terminal Access
3 route passes through more than one local jurisdiction, the
4 agency has informed the Department in writing that the local
5 roads and intersections on the proposed ... meet all
6 geometric criteria."

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Each agency, okay.

8 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Excuse me?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's okay, you left
10 out a word, but each affected agency.

11 MS. ROBB: There should be a comma before "where"
12 because it's a dependant clause but it's kind of unclear
13 where to put the comma exactly.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We have it after
15 jurisdiction. We say, where the proposed Terminal Access
16 route passes through more than one local jurisdiction,
17 comma, each affected agency has informed the Department
18 blah-blah-blah.

19 MS. ROBB: Right. So it should read, only if,
20 comma, the proposed TA route, et cetera. But there is
21 really no room for a comma there. The dependant clause
22 should be pulled out with two commas, one in front and one
23 in the back. It would make it read better but it's not
24 certain where to put it.

25 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Well we can work on that.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. We have
2 editorial license.

3 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: As long as it's not a
5 policy issue. All right, are we ready to consider this
6 item? Is there any motion to adopt it with the change, the
7 word "if" in number C would be changed to "where."

8 And in D we would pluralize State highway ramps
9 and intersections so D would say, the Department has
10 verified that the State highway ramps or intersections meet
11 all geometric criteria for STAA trucks.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I make the motion.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we have a second?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Are we bringing D up to
15 be a new B so it would be A, D, B, C in that order?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Not unless Caltrans
17 wants to do so.

18 MS. ROBB: That might imply that the state should
19 do their work first. I'm not sure that we should be doing
20 that.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: We like it the way it is.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So there is a
23 motion, do we have a second?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, second by John.

1 And do we have any comments from any alternate members or
2 other guests in the audience? Bill Winter.

3 MR. WINTER: Yes, this is Bill Winter. And I
4 guess I heard Don say that this item really doesn't go into
5 the detail for the service access routes, the focus of the
6 discussion has generally been on the terminal access
7 signage. I did see there is just one change though. It is
8 made on page seven to the concurrence for service access.
9 Where the proposal for the signing has the written
10 concurrence by the local agency.

11 I am just curious, it's more of a question or a
12 helpful clarification for me since I think we probably have
13 some of these situations up in the Gorman area on the
14 Grapevine where the truckers are going to get off and go to,
15 you know, get fuel or food. What is meant there by
16 concurrence? Are you looking for the local agency to also
17 perform a geometric review or is that just not something
18 that you have to worry about if it's within that one mile
19 distance?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Casey, could you answer
21 that.

22 MS. ROBB: We have not been looking at service
23 access routes. They are rarely a problem that comes to our
24 work unit and it's just not our focus. We could certainly
25 look at that in the future but right now we are not focused

1 on that at all.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I think the logic there
3 is that the service access areas are sufficiently close to
4 the freeway system that they are fairly built up and built
5 to accommodate general truck traffic and by default STAA
6 trucks can probably fit in there as well.

7 MS. ROBB: In my 12 years here we have not gotten
8 a single application for a service access route. They were
9 set up before my time, probably in the '80s, and it has just
10 never been an issue, in my experience.

11 MR. WINTER: Thanks for that. I know, for
12 instance, as I mentioned Gorman, that area is a very rural
13 community. But with growth being what it is eventually, you
14 know, geometric changes could occur. That's something just
15 for my own edification I'll have to be aware of if we ever
16 realign roads or reconfigure any intersections up there.
17 Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: For the record that
19 was Bill Winter. Any other comments?

20 MR. T. GREENWOOD: Good morning, Todd Greenwood,
21 city of Stockton. I'm here to speak on another matter but I
22 felt compelled to just try to clarify. On the -- so the
23 asterisks that is sprinkled through this as it relates to
24 the geometric criteria, the use of encroaching into the
25 adjacent or opposing lane. I'm fine with the opposing lane

1 because that's a safety issue. I'd like clarification on if
2 a truck is going to make a right turn onto say a six lane
3 roadway where you would have three lanes to turn into, is it
4 to be interpreted that we would have to meet the corner
5 radius or geometric requirements for them to turn into that
6 immediate lane or is it the -- is it encroaching into the
7 approach lane? Is it clear on the question?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: It's governed by the
9 Highway Design Manual.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But on the STAAs --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: For designing the
12 turning movement.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On the STAA super
14 trucks, if you have a corner radius of less than 50 feet you
15 are not in compliance. And that's why a whole lot of
16 intersections probably are going to be thrown off compliance
17 because they have a whole bunch of 35 foot curb radius.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And the bigger the curb
19 radius the more dangerous it is for pedestrians and
20 bicyclists at the intersections, so that's where we have to
21 balance the width with all modes of transportation or it can
22 be -- it can decrease their visibility.

23 MR. T. GREENWOOD: But my understanding is that
24 the trucker, if he's like in the right turn lane and he's
25 turning on a green, he can use all of those lanes that are

1 available. Is that not correct?

2 MS. ROBB: Can I say something about that?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Sure.

4 MS. ROBB: Casey Robb here. I understand the need
5 for flexibility. I would not mind taking out that word
6 "adjacent" as long as people know to go to the Design Manual
7 because these are all covered in detail, the issues, and
8 there ought to be some flexibility here. So I would leave
9 it to the judgment of the engineer that was making the
10 evaluation.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The way I read D, it
12 talks about a vehicle going straight ahead that isn't
13 overlapping into an adjacent lane or an opposing lane. I
14 don't read it to say that when a vehicle is turning it can't
15 turn into the -- when making a right turn it is disallowed
16 from turning into the number one lane of the receiving
17 street. I don't see that language here.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That that you are
19 referring to is not part of D, that's part of the asterisked
20 section that is below D and is referenced by asterisks in
21 the sections above. So the asterisked geometric criteria,
22 which talks about analyzing intersections, ramps and curves,
23 is referenced in a number of contexts.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Because of the word
25 "curve" in there I think it's critical for the word

1 'adjacent" to also be in there.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: My interpretation is that
3 with D the asterisk is under geometric truck criteria and
4 this is the part where the Department is verifying. So that
5 criteria that we see in the asterisk is something that the
6 Department will verify.

7 The local agency -- the local agency is
8 responsible for informing the Department in writing that
9 their roads and intersections are acceptable. And there is
10 no reference to the asterisk so I am thinking that you, as
11 the engineer for your agency, have the ability to determine
12 what you want to do there.

13 MR. T. GREENWOOD: I'll bring your attention to
14 Item B, that it talks about the local agency has informed,
15 meet all geometric criteria, and then asterisk. So that
16 asterisk is being --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Likewise C.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Yeah, I missed that.

19 MR. T. GREENWOOD: -- is being applied throughout.
20 So I'm just concerned that the local agency is going to be
21 bound to having something stricter than what we are doing
22 today.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Casey, can I ask you a
24 question?

25 MS. ROBB: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Are you doing any type of
2 intersection or end-of-ramp analysis now, you personally?

3 MS. ROBB: I'm sorry, can you say that again.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Do you personally do any
5 type of ramp, end-of-ramp or intersection analysis now for
6 STAA trucks?

7 MS. ROBB: I help the districts when they're
8 short-staffed but it's mostly a district engineer duty.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. I think it will
10 help the Committee if you could explain to us what you are
11 looking at. Because that would help to explain whether or
12 not the truck can, in fact, get into the adjacent lane using
13 your truck turn templates. Whether the truck can encroach
14 into the adjacent lane while it's making a turn at an
15 intersection or end-of-ramp.

16 MS. ROBB: There's a lot more flexibility at
17 intersections than there would be, say, on a curve. Yes,
18 they can get into an adjacent lane at an intersection.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. I hope that that
20 satisfies everybody. Because we do not want anyone
21 encroaching into an adjacent lane for, I'll call it a
22 through traffic movement. I would say that's really what
23 this is trying to say. And with the clarification from
24 Casey that at the intersections that you can use multiple
25 lanes in the same direction to make your turning movement,

1 we should all be -- I hope we are all satisfied with that.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thank you very much, Don,
3 for that clarification.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we are going to
5 bring this item back to the Committee. We have a motion on
6 the floor, we have a second. Any further discussion on this
7 item before we vote on it?

8 Okay, hearing no desire for further discussion
9 we'll bring it to a vote. I think we have discussed the
10 minor editorial amendments we have made to this, do I need
11 to repeat them? Does everyone understand the motion at
12 hand?

13 Okay. All those in favor of the motion raise your
14 hands.

15 (Show of hands.)

16 Unanimous, thank you.

17 Okay. It's 12:25. I am going to continue with
18 the agenda and see how much progress we make. Hopefully
19 we'll be able to have a very short lunch break but we're
20 going to have to move along. We have only covered two items
21 thus far.

22 So we'll go to Item 12-2a regarding work zone
23 areas. This one has been submitted by Caltrans. And let me
24 just refresh my memory on what this one is. It's regarding
25 portable changeable message signs. Don.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you. This begins
2 on page 25 and we are requesting the Committee -- make a
3 recommendation to adopt an amended policy on the use of
4 channelizing devices to delineate portable changeable
5 message signs in a work zone.

6 As far as the background goes, the current policy
7 on using channelizing devices to delineate a portable
8 changeable message sign is to delineate it with a taper
9 consisting of 9 cones at a spacing of 25 feet apart. This
10 works out to about 200 feet long and doesn't work well in an
11 urban setting where you have less speed and also less room
12 to put in the cones.

13 So what we are proposing here is that we use a
14 shoulder taper that's denoted in a figure on page 26. And
15 there is also, although it doesn't show in there, I believe
16 that Caltrans is proposing to amend this to add the formula
17 to this chart as well or to this figure that helps explain
18 what that $1/3L$ is; is that correct, Gordon?

19 MR. WANG: No, we were going to add a note to
20 refer to the table. The table is already referenced to in
21 the text and it was suggested also to refer to the same
22 table in the figure.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, thank you. So what
24 we are proposing as an addition to the existing language is
25 as follows. This is for Section 6F.60 Portable Changeable

1 Message Signs. Added to paragraph 30:

2 "When used, advanced warning delineation is
3 not needed if the portable changeable message sign
4 is behind a barrier, more than 2 feet behind the
5 curb, or 15 feet or more from the edge of any
6 roadway (see Section 6C.04). If the portable
7 changeable message sign is placed on shoulder or
8 partially blocking the shoulder (including
9 overhangs), should be closed off by a taper of
10 channelizing devices with a length of $1/3L$ using
11 the formulas in Tables 6C-3, 6C-3(CA) and 6C-4
12 (see Section 6C.08). See Figure 6F-104(CA) for
13 typical layout using channelizing devices to
14 delineate a portable changeable message sign on
15 the shoulder."

16 We have also added the Option paragraph 30a:

17 "For incident management before additional
18 resources are available or for short duration use
19 (see Section 6G.02) or when portable changeable
20 message sign is placed well beyond the shoulder
21 but partially within 15 feet from the edge of any
22 roadway it may be delineated with a minimum of a
23 30 feet taper formed by three traffic cones."

24 We have also added to paragraph 32:

25 "If the portable changeable message sign is

1 stored within a shoulder or partially blocking a
2 shoulder, the shoulder should be closed according
3 to Section 6G.07. If the portable changeable
4 message sign is stored well beyond the shoulder
5 but within the clear zone, it should be delineated
6 by a taper of channelizing devices with a length
7 of $1/3L$ using the formulas in Tables 6C-3, GC-
8 3(CA) AND 6C-4 (see Section 6C.08). Clear zone is
9 defined by AASHTO's 'Roadside Design Guide' (see
10 Section 1A.11). See Figure 6F-104(CA) for typical
11 layout using channelizing devices to delineate a
12 portable changeable message sign on shoulder."

13 We have also deleted the last sentence from
14 paragraph 33 which said:

15 "If the sign trailer is located within 15
16 feet of the edge of the traveled way, it should be
17 delineated with a taper consisting of 9 cones
18 placed at a spacing of 25 feet apart."

19 Gordon, I am not familiar with whether or not we
20 have added anything to the actual figure 6F-104(CA). Can
21 you explain anything that has been added or deleted.

22 MR. WANG: The Figure 6F-104(CA) is a brand new
23 figure. We discussed this particular agenda item in the
24 last meeting. And it was the suggestion of the Committee to
25 add a figure for clarification and this is what -- the

1 figure is the only change from last meeting's agenda to this
2 meeting.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, that concludes the
4 presentation of this item.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Committee
6 members, are there any questions or do you want to start
7 discussion of this item?

8 Does anyone see any controversy in this item?

9 I just had one question regarding the figure where
10 we show $1/3L$. Is there any more elaboration as to what L
11 refers to? Is it part of the formula $WS^2/60$? Do we want to
12 refer to some other part of the manual that defines what L
13 is?

14 MR. WANG: Yes, we are going to say $1/3L$ and see
15 tables 6C-3(CA). And there's -- I couldn't -- well, in the
16 short time I had I located 6H-4(CA) which is the same table
17 that's repeated in 6C-3(CA) and it's displayed on the
18 screen. Basically it just shows the $1/3L$ shoulder close
19 taper is speed dependant and that shows what the dimensions
20 to use.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any questions,
22 discussion?

23 Well, before we go to a motion I'll ask if there
24 is anyone from the audience that wants to make a comment on
25 this one.

1 I see no one, do we have a motion on the table?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Motion to approve.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Second.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That was from you,
5 Bryan?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Bryan and
8 seconded by Michael. Any final discussion?

9 All in favor raise your hands.

10 (Show of hands.)

11 Unanimous, thank you. Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: We set a record.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. Okay, we are
14 going now to Item number 12-3, a proposal from Mike Robinson
15 of the County Supervisors Association to discuss arrow
16 boards.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 This item is a recommendation to make some changes to the
19 use of arrow boards for lane closures under certain
20 conditions. There are a number of different reasons why
21 this should be considered now. One perfect example is with
22 the increasing construction costs and maintenance costs and
23 decreasing construction and maintenance money agencies are
24 seeking ways of saving on their projects. Obviously it is
25 important to ensure that safety is maintained.

1 But there are situations that can exist on a
2 project where sometimes the use of arrow boards, though they
3 would tend to be -- though they are not mandated, close to
4 mandated, should be allowed to be more -- left to the
5 discretion of the local agency. There were actually two
6 different agencies, the County Department of Public Works of
7 Los Angeles and also San Francisco MTA that has made some
8 requests for that consideration.

9 And with your permission, this came to me from
10 Bill Winter who is my counterpart in Southern California
11 counties, and I would like to ask him to come forward to
12 better detail some of the requests. I also am aware that
13 there are some items in here that he has recommended for
14 change in order to get a little more agreement, I think,
15 with this Committee. So with your permission I would like
16 to ask him forward to provide a little --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Bill.

18 MR. WINTER: Good morning again or afternoon now.
19 Bill Winter with the Los Angeles County Department of Public
20 Works.

21 As Mr. Robinson stated, this was something that we
22 did bring up in comments on the draft 2012 MUTCD, CA MUTCD.

23 There's two elements of this request, one is -- regarding
24 arrow boards. And as you see in the agenda, the proposal is
25 to expand on the option statement in Section 6H.01 to note,

1 kind of building off of the last sentence that is currently
2 there where it says "Fewer devices may be used based on
3 field conditions." To build off of that by noting that the
4 engineer or engineer's designee can make a determination of
5 when arrow boards for temporary lane closures are required
6 or optional based on duration and scope of work.

7 I think in re-thinking through this it may be more
8 appropriate instead of making that statement in 6H.01 is to
9 perhaps add this instead as an Option statement and head it,
10 give it a heading of "Option" as an option to the guidance
11 statement that is given in 6F.61.

12 And if you look at 6F.61, in that guidance
13 statement in paragraph 02, I don't know if that's -- I don't
14 have the capability to pull it up for you. If you see that
15 guidance statement, it's on page 1078 of the 2012 CA MUTCD.

16 The guidance statement today says:

17 "An arrow board in the arrow or chevron mode
18 should be used to advise approaching traffic of a
19 lane closure along major multi-lane roadways in
20 situations involving heavy traffic volume, high
21 speeds and/or limited sight distances or in other
22 locations and other conditions where road users
23 are less likely to expect such lane closures."

24 I think we could all agree. The use of arrow
25 boards is an outstanding tool for advising motorists of

1 these kind of situations. I think the elements that are
2 listed in that guidance statement leave some engineering
3 judgment to come into play so it is appropriate that it's a
4 should statement.

5 But yet as you look at how you exercise your
6 engineering judgment you are given to evaluate situations of
7 heavy traffic volumes. You had a discussion earlier this
8 morning about what constitutes low traffic volumes, so here
9 is a situation that goes in the other direction to say for
10 heavy volumes. High speeds. Again a pretty broad statement
11 there. You had the discussion, again, earlier today about
12 other lower speeds and so on. Sight distance, other
13 locations or other situations, so there's lots of
14 discretion.

15 But I think the importance of what we wanted to
16 add to this is that however that discretion is exercised it
17 should come from the engineer or the engineer's designee. I
18 think we don't want the crew, per se, or others that are out
19 operationally doing the work to simply act on their own
20 merits of looking at that situation trying to make those
21 kind of judgment calls. It would be preferable for the
22 engineer to give that kind of direction. It's left to the
23 agency itself to decide if that's through some kind of
24 policy document or other instructional type of work.

25 I know the -- in our case we will make it very

1 clear to our crews, our construction crews, our maintenance
2 crews. But a lot of times we have permittees come in to our
3 public counters, utility companies being a very frequent
4 customer, and we'll ask them pretty much to follow the same
5 thing that we would be asking ourselves to follow.

6 And occasionally we do get pushed back because an
7 arrow board, as Mr. Robinson said, is roughly a \$6,000 cost
8 to procure outright. Rental costs and so on being what they
9 are sometimes there is that push back to it. The intent
10 here is to make it clear that the engineer is that decider.

11 The factors in the guidance statement being something that
12 the engineer should consider.

13 The things that aren't stated in the guidance
14 statement or what we are proposing to be put in here is that
15 there may be situations of duration and scope that should
16 also be considered.

17 Duration, maybe it could even be expanded further
18 to say, if the work is being done in the off-peak hours.
19 Where it says now, it involves heavy traffic volume. But if
20 you're out there in the off-peak hour you may not encounter
21 that situation. And common, common practice is for work to
22 occur in the off-peak hours when you have to take a lane out
23 of service.

24 So I guess I could break this down because the
25 other one is a somewhat different, different topic. But if

1 it's the pleasure of the Committee I could stop there and
2 take questions on it before I move into the other element of
3 this proposal.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Bill, could you
5 clarify. Are you adding a statement to 6F.61?

6 MR. WINTER: I think what I'm suggesting here is
7 rather than the statement that is in your agenda, which is
8 building on 6H.01, but to take that statement and instead
9 put it into 6F.61.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

11 MR. WINTER: Give it a heading of "Option" so it's
12 consistent with the Manual's format here of giving an option
13 statement to a guidance statement.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. But I notice
15 the option statement has the word "shall" in it. So it's
16 like a requirement that the engineer shall make the
17 determination.

18 MR. WINTER: The statement is the engineer or
19 engineer's designee may determine when arrow boards for
20 temporary lane closures are required or optional based on
21 duration and scope of work.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you would change it
23 to "may determine."

24 MR. WINTER: Right.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So the engineer may

1 determine, may approve their use.

2 MR. WINTER: Or lack, lack of use. Either
3 requiring it or optional.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And then who is the
5 engineer? If we are designing a project and a detour plan
6 is it the resident engineer on site or is it the design
7 engineer who is determining what the detour operation should
8 be?

9 MR. WINTER: Well, I believe for your temporary
10 traffic control plans this really doesn't -- the intent of
11 this isn't to apply there. If those plans need to be
12 changed there is guidance elsewhere in the manual that says
13 that must -- those kind of changes must also be done by the
14 engineer or engineer's designee.

15 I think where we are coming from is from an
16 operational sense of what we gather and seeing how other
17 agencies also do their work. If there is short duration
18 work, off-peak hour work, you'll occasionally not see an
19 arrow board for those situations. Somebody, somebody is
20 making a decision. It's not always clear who that is. But
21 somebody is making a decision not to use an arrow board in
22 that situation.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So just to simplify,
24 what if we were to add a comma after that section you cited
25 in 6F.61 paragraph 02? Just added a comma after the word

1 "closures" append the sentence to say, "as determined by the
2 local agency." Would that achieve the same objective?

3 MR. WINTER: You're talking in paragraph 02 of the
4 Guidance after the --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: After the word
6 "closures." After the very last word we would add a comma
7 and just say "as determined by the agency."

8 MR. WINTER: Yeah. And I think that's a -- that's
9 one element of it. But I think where I was going or I think
10 our concern is, the other use of the terms above all of
11 that, which is the high -- involving heavy traffic volumes,
12 high speeds and/or limited sight distance. It's the heavy
13 traffic volumes at high speeds that get to be a little more
14 of a judgment call. And there may be a circumstance where,
15 like I said, you're not out there when you're dealing with
16 heavy volume, it may be in an off-peak type of a situation.
17 And the fact just heavy itself isn't defined, it's left to
18 that discretion.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Discretion of the
20 local agency.

21 MR. WINTER: Right. And there is no statement
22 here, though, of duration. So if you want to add the word
23 "duration" in there as another factor to, to consider.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any questions of
25 Bill?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: After reading
2 paragraph 02 in its existing state, it does have a "should"
3 in there and it doesn't seem that your language would be
4 improving what's already been written. It's saying that it
5 should be used and then it goes into the criteria of heavy
6 traffic volumes, high speed and/or limited sight distance.
7 So it is saying and/or, creating quite a bit of flexibility
8 for the engineer to assess when it's to be implemented.

9 MR. WINTER: As a guidance statement, you're
10 correct. The use of the word "should" though, for all
11 practical sense, means you really need to do it in these
12 situations unless you have a good reason not to. Those
13 other statements, it's not giving you a complete reason not
14 to do it if you start to exercise your engineering judgment
15 in these, in these areas.

16 For my agency and what this really is encouraging
17 you to do is establish some kind of policy or direction to
18 those that are making those decisions. What isn't entirely
19 clear is the engineer is the one that should be directing
20 that, not the entity -- or whoever it is, your crew or
21 whoever, that's out there on the day of doing the job.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
23 question.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I am trying to

1 understand, I am trying to understand the reason for the
2 introduction of the item. Because when Mr. Robinson
3 introduced the item he said that he wants -- the intent will
4 be to use less arrow boards, at least that was my
5 impression, because of increased costs and all of that.

6 But when you discussed the item I got the
7 impression that you want to make sure that people don't
8 delete arrow boards. That the engineers have discretion and
9 the crew out there don't just willy-nilly take the arrow
10 boards out. Is that -- you see that -- So what is it? Are
11 we trying to use less arrow boards by introducing this or
12 more arrow boards?

13 MR. WINTER: Well, like I say, it's somewhere in-
14 between that. Because what you have is a situation
15 operationally where we know that they are not being used.
16 And it may be because of factors that aren't listed here
17 such as the duration of the work, that if it's a short
18 duration.

19 And they are realizing that some of these other
20 factors, you know, like heavy volume, maybe it's off-peak
21 hour, they are not out there when there's necessarily --
22 whoever is making that determination would say that's a
23 heavy volume of traffic. Or they feel they can control
24 speeds in other ways so it's not necessarily a high-speed
25 situation.

1 So there's judgment being exercised in what I'm
2 saying pragmatically we know is they are not being used in
3 all situations. Yet as a guidance statement of using the
4 word "should" it's really not giving you -- you know, it's
5 basically saying you really need to put these in.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Hamid, I liked Bill's
7 recommendation because in my interpretation it takes away
8 some of the mandate. Even though it says "should," "should"
9 is much more of a mandate than "may."

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We recognize that this
12 is, all of these are, they tend to be general and the
13 discretion of the engineer is much more detailed and focused
14 on the specific issue that he is working with. So to give
15 the engineer more leeway in the decision of use of an arrow
16 board or not I think is critical and in certain situations
17 will result in a lower use of arrow boards than is currently
18 happening.

19 As Bill was talking about, duration. If you've
20 got a traffic control, a traffic control area set up that's
21 only going to be for a half a day, even though the standard
22 shows that an arrow board is there, for the engineer to have
23 the ability to exercise his discretion and remove that, I
24 think that's important.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So if that is your

1 intent then maybe under 6F.61 also then that "should" needs
2 to change to a "may." Because typically the way that
3 "should" is interpreted is that if you're an engineer and
4 you read "should" you do it except if you really justify why
5 you shouldn't do it. It's not as strong as "shall." But
6 most people who practice, the minute they see "should" they
7 say, oh, I better use it because otherwise I have to put a
8 note in my design file of why I didn't comply with this. So
9 if that is the intent, to give flexibility, then we may want
10 to change that "should" on 6F.61 also to a "may" and then
11 follow it by "engineer or engineer designee" at the end of
12 paragraph.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Since we are moving our
14 discussion over from 6H.01 to 6H.61, I agree.

15 MR. WINTER: 6F.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Sorry, 6F.61. So I
17 agree.

18 MR. WINTER: And I think in 6H.01, along the lines
19 of what you are just now saying, the statement there says
20 that you could use fewer devices --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No.

22 MR. WINTER: -- based on that engineering
23 judgment. And I guess here is where a lot of this is coming
24 from. If you look at some of the typical applications, and
25 I think everybody did a good job in the update of the Manual

1 on the typical applications and going through them. But
2 there are still some, some places where, say, this one is
3 Typical Application 22, where the arrow board is shown but
4 there is not the word "optional." So it implies that for
5 that situation and some of the other companion typical
6 applications in the TA-22 family that you don't have the
7 discretion to omit that.

8 I think we dealt with this, I think in a workshop
9 when we were talking about arrow boards and other typical
10 applications that had the word "optional." We struck out
11 the word "optional" and instead just referred -- if you go
12 to those you'll see the reference is 6F.61. So for pretty
13 much all of the other typical applications below the arrow
14 board depiction it gives 6F.61, see 6F.61. So just in the
15 Typical Application 22 it doesn't have that but here is an
16 example, I believe, in TA-21 where it does say see Section
17 6F.61.

18 Realize, I have crews out working. They're not
19 even looking at the narrative, per se. They are looking at
20 a typical application that this is what they have been told,
21 you follow this TA. They're seeing the arrow board -- we're
22 telling them, now you do need to look at the narrative in
23 6F.61. If they don't see that reference there they see the
24 arrow board and they think, well, let's call to get that
25 arrow board out here.

1 So besides the narrative changes that you just
2 talked about I guess one other element of this that isn't in
3 the agenda but I'm asking is in Typical Application 22,
4 which also includes 22a and 22b as well as Typical
5 Application 24, that it simply add the reference like you
6 see here that it just says "see Section 6F.61."

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Then that makes it
8 clear that when they go and read that, assuming that we
9 change that "should" to a "may," they know that it's a may
10 and it's an engineer call and it makes it all clear. It's a
11 good suggestion.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, can we have a
13 clarification of the item before us. In the agenda it said
14 this -- the wording you had proposed was in Section 6A.01.
15 Is it 6A.01 or 6H.01?

16 MR. WINTER: 6H.01 for the arrow board discussion
17 we're having. I'll get to -- the next one, I believe, is
18 6A.01, which was more of the San Francisco --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: 6A.01 is like the
20 general statement.

21 MR. WINTER: Yeah, it's more encompassing of other
22 elements of typical applications in general.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So for the item
24 before us, how would we amend 6A.01, 6H.01 and 6F.61? I
25 just want to be real clear what's before us. I'd like to

1 hear the language.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On the language on the
3 6A.01 and 6H.01, I'm okay with what's here. On the 6F.61
4 what I suggest is that if we change -- under Guidance we
5 change that "should" to a "may" and then maybe at the end
6 after "Closure" put a comma and do "as decided by engineer
7 or engineer designee." And then with the comment that
8 Mr. Winter mentioned. That on the TAs we add that sentence,
9 that clause under all the arrow boards referring to 6F.61.

10 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Where is the word "should?"

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm looking at 6F.61.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: It's paragraph 60.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And that's on top

14 of --

15 MR. WINTER: That's on page --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's on top of the
17 page --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: 1078.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, that's on top of
20 1078, 02 under Guidance.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Paragraph 02.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, it's paragraph
23 02 on 1078, page 1078. It says an arrow board in the arrow
24 or chevron mode should be used. And if you change that to a
25 "may" that gives it also the option that you don't have to

1 come up with a reason not to do it but it's pretty much your
2 discretion whether to use it or not.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So with the item
4 before us the language that we see in red on page 28 would
5 be added to Section 6A.01?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: It would be 6H.01.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And not 6A.01?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: No, that's 6H.01.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: 6H.01.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's the 6H.01.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Did you want to
12 modify it? Because you say "Option" and you say the word
13 "shall." So are you changing the word "shall" to "may?"

14 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Yes.

15 MS. McLAUGHLIN: So we're -- I'm still confused.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The engineer or the
17 engineer's designee may approve -- well, the above says
18 "shall be approved by the engineer." And then if you change
19 the next paragraph to "may" that kind of dilutes the
20 "shall."

21 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: You're right, you're
22 right about that. I would be fine, I'm fine with not
23 changing 6H.01 at all but adding a reference to 6F.61
24 paragraph 02.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think if you modify

1 6F.61 paragraph 02 --

2 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I think that does it.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- at the top of page
4 1078 it does exactly what you guys want.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I think it does too. So
6 my suggestion is no modification to 6H.01.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So in other
8 words, the language you have on page 28 you are no longer
9 proposing.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: No, 27.

11 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Page 27.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We're only, we're only
13 looking at page 27 at this point.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, I was missing
15 that page.

16 MS. McLAUGHLIN: "May" is already there.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So there is no change,
19 the red doesn't go in there. There is no change recommended
20 to 6H.01.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you would keep the
22 language as shown on page 27 or delete it?

23 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Delete all red shown
24 there.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Do not make any change to
2 6H.01.

3 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Got that part.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: The recommendation now is
5 to make change to 6F.61 paragraph 02.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And what words would
7 you add to paragraph 02?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And paragraph 02 would be
9 to change the word "should" to "may." And at the end of
10 that paragraph it would read "closures as determined by the
11 local agency."

12 MR. WINTER: The engineer or the engineer's
13 designee --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

15 MR. WINTER: -- of the public agency.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Determined by the --

17 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Engineer or the
18 engineer's designee.

19 MR. WINTER: Of the public agency or authority
20 having jurisdiction over the highway. Because that
21 statement is consistent throughout in Part 6.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Do you have
23 that, Devinder?

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I didn't get it

1 all but I understand the thrust. Okay, Roberta?

2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: We got it.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

4 MS. McLAUGHLIN: What was confusing us was you
5 were taking the two paragraphs.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: You were looking at the wrong
8 paragraph.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right.

10 MR. WINTER: And I will -- if you want me to move
11 into it now I do have -- part of this is on page 28 of your
12 agenda. This is a suggestion to change Section 6A.01.

13 MS. McLAUGHLIN: So do we --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We just went over that
15 I thought?

16 MS. McLAUGHLIN: So the point is, do we want to
17 vote on this first change first and then go to 6A.01?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I got confused
19 because I didn't have page 27.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And my apology, I didn't
21 make it very clear. This is actually two separate proposals
22 and probably could have actually been two separate items but
23 related. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we perhaps
24 vote on these independently.

25 MS. McLAUGHLIN: I agree.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What's throwing me off
2 is that you've got the word "option" and then you have the
3 word "shall." And you said you were going to change the
4 "shall" to a "may." Then I said, well doesn't that conflict
5 with the sentence above.

6 MS. McLAUGHLIN: You're transposing the two
7 paragraphs. Don't even look at 6A.01 on page 28 yet, we
8 haven't gotten there yet.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I thought that's where
10 we are now.

11 MR. WINTER: No.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: No.

13 MR. WINTER: We are on the 6H.01.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we are not
15 doing the language that you have on page 27, we are
16 modifying the language to 6F.61. Change "should" to "may"
17 and then to append a sentence to say "as determined by the
18 engineer or engineer's designee of the public authority."

19 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: You understand that
20 correctly.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. The only
22 concern I have about doing that is that's federal language
23 that says "should." And it seems like we want to then
24 dilute the federal language from a "should" to a "may." And
25 I know we have some limited discretion to do things like

1 that but it's usually only if they're prescribed in the
2 Vehicle Code or there's some other law that compels us to do
3 that.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, we have
5 been changing "should" to "may" in the Manual as part of
6 adoption. It's "shall" that we have stayed away from.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well maybe we need to
8 ask our federal representative, Steve, to give us some
9 guidance on that.

10 MR. PYBURN: You're going to have to tell me where
11 we're at.

12 MS. McLAUGHLIN: We're here, page 1078. So let me
13 clarify. Page 1078 paragraph 02, top of the page. The
14 first "should" in that sentence being changed to a "may."

15 MR. PYBURN: Yeah, we could live with that.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It was guidance
17 language anyway. It's guidance language.

18 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Identify yourself for the record.

19 MR. PYBURN: This is Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
20 Administration. That would be acceptable.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What is the philosophy
22 of the feds regarding going to -- a "should" to a "may?"

23 MR. PYBURN: You can't change the "shoulds"
24 without concurrence. I'm sorry, you can't change the
25 "shalls." Substantial conformance rests on how you treat

1 the standards in the federal manual, which is defined as the
2 "shall" statements. The "should" and the "may" statements
3 are advisory and we don't have a lot of -- would have much
4 more leniency.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And it's a guidance
6 statement anyway, it's not a "should" in a standard
7 statement.

8 MR. PYBURN: That's right.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you for
10 that.

11 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yay.

12 MR. WINTER: And again, this has been bifurcated
13 so I apologize for the confusion up front but I'll go into
14 the second part of this now, which --

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: But let's vote on this
16 first.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: If we can, Mr. Chairman,
18 this is separate to the point where it would probably be
19 beneficial to go ahead and vote on this piece before we hear
20 the second piece.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, we'll take it in
22 that order. So we know what has been proposed for 6F.61,
23 change a "should" to a "may" and then some other language at
24 the end of the sentence. Any more discussion among
25 Committee Members here on that?

1 My sense is that if that is adopted that would
2 reduce the number of arrow boards that are being applied
3 since it is strictly up to the engineer, correct?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I would agree with that.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And is there a
6 safety concern regarding that?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I don't believe so.
8 We've got -- if it's the engineer's discretion, they are
9 going to be considering every case. They are going to have
10 a better understanding of the situation than we do in
11 general application. We trust the engineer in many more
12 ways than just that to keep a safe environment and I don't
13 believe that any of them intentionally would sacrifice
14 safety for any kind of other savings.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: And isn't the objective
16 here not necessarily to increase or decrease the use of
17 arrow boards but rather to give the engineer the sole
18 discretion as to whether or not they should be used?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: That's the intent.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. I know when we
21 went through on the figures 6H and changed -- many arrow
22 boards had "optional" below them.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And because of the
25 "should" language here we revised it to say, well see the

1 criteria in 6F.61.

2 My concern is that if you make it an option the
3 sense among many jurisdictions or contractors will be, we
4 don't have to do this. That they won't give the due thought
5 and consideration to the speed and volume of traffic and
6 unexpected conditions. And like that they say, you know,
7 this is strictly optional, we don't have to do it, and it
8 won't be required as much.

9 And I am just concerned that there may be
10 situations on higher volume, higher speed roadways where
11 your gut feeling tells you you should have an arrow board
12 but, you know, the contractor is going to say, well, this is
13 an item that is not required and I didn't bid on it because
14 I don't have to do it. I am just worried that it might not
15 be installed where maybe it should be installed. I just
16 have a concern with diluting the language from what has been
17 adopted. It's just, it's just my opinion.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I guess I would concur.

19 Somehow I got lost, especially when you went to insert the
20 language in the second paragraph where it's specifically
21 talking about multi-lane, heavy volumes, high speeds and
22 other conditions where road users are less likely to expect
23 the lane closure. Isn't that exactly where we'd put the
24 arrow board?

25 It's a "should" it's not a "shall," you have some

1 discretion, but "may" I think softens it up too much.
2 Especially when quite often we need something to beat the
3 contractors with to say, you should put this in here and we
4 are going to require you to put it in there, when they're
5 trying to nickel and dime us to save costs on detour plans.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Bill.

7 MR. WINTER: And I'll go back to how I started
8 this presentation of it. I wasn't immediately asking for
9 that term "should" to go to a "may." I think I could accept
10 that if it stays as a "should" my -- the way I started to
11 present this is, to add below the Guidance, to add an Option
12 statement. And then make the Option very narrowly focused
13 as to when you wouldn't follow that which was, a short
14 duration type of a closure or another situation there.

15 But only the engineer or the engineer's designee
16 is making that determination. So if you want to leave it as
17 a "should" but give, you know, but without having to
18 continuously document every time you are going to have to
19 deviate from that. But by giving some wiggle in here by
20 saying there is an option to the guidance when you have that
21 short duration type of situation.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Regardless of how it
25 is being practiced, the way that it is, even if you don't

1 change anything, that's exactly what it says. It says it's
2 an engineer's call. Because a "should" statement doesn't
3 mean that it's automatically done. So the engineer in
4 charge of the project decides if he or she wants an arrow
5 board or not. So except if you want to really soften it,
6 otherwise -- even if you don't say anything, we don't change
7 a word, a single word, that's exactly an engineering call.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Here is my suggestion.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On a project you
10 decide whether to put an arrow board or you don't put an
11 arrow board. And in terms of how it's practiced within the
12 jurisdiction, that's like coordination between the design
13 office and the people in the field and who makes these
14 calls.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think it would be
16 helpful to have some sort of language which would clarify
17 those situations where arrow boards really are not
18 necessary, such as short duration and whatever else you
19 might want to come up with. I think it could fit as a
20 Support statement. It possibly could fit as an Option
21 statement. But we have a "should" statement here so if we
22 are going to keep it as a "should" statement then a Support
23 statement would serve to clarify and provide information on
24 those situations where an arrow board is really overkill.

25 And so if we want to, if we can craft that

1 language very quickly here we could act on that if we want.

2 But if we want to mull this over bring it back to the

3 Committee for the next meeting we could do that as well.

4 Because the proposal is a policy matter and it significantly

5 changed from what was submitted. So how would you like to

6 handle that?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Well we have already had

8 -- we have had good input from the feds and so we recognize

9 that there are changes that could be made. I think rather

10 than try and craft something right now why don't we go ahead

11 and bring it back to this committee at the next meeting with

12 something a little more refined as either an option or along

13 those lines.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, may I?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If this item is going

17 to be continued and come back I think it helps, at least for

18 me as one member, to see what's the problem we are trying to

19 fix. Because if, for example, say LA County today, it's

20 completely your discretion where to put arrow board, where

21 not to put arrow board. There is nothing in the manual that

22 says you must put it here or don't put it there. It's an

23 engineering call.

24 So are we trying -- what is the -- what is it that

25 we are trying to achieve? My understanding was that you

1 wanted to give more flexibility to the engineer so that he
2 says, okay, I make those decisions. Then we fix the 6F.61
3 and change a "should" to a "may" and the feds don't have a
4 problem with it and everybody is happy.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I can share my experience
6 as a city traffic engineer and now as someone who is
7 responsible for maintenance activities. When you see the
8 "should" there, from a liability perspective that's quite a
9 mandate. And so we're -- even when we're, when we believe
10 that it's not necessary to have that arrow board out there
11 we know that just one small mistake out there is going to
12 cost us millions of dollars if we chose not to, because it's
13 real difficult to define to a jury why in this particular
14 case we didn't have one even though it said we should have
15 one. So it's a scenario like that that I think sooner or
16 later we -- and I think we can bring it back as an option
17 that we can define those situations where --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Exactly.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: -- we're not comfortable
20 -- where we're comfortable not having an arrow board, even
21 though the standard suggests that we should.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I think that helps
23 a lot, like with some of the larger counties and cities.
24 Like if they come up with like a case specific and say okay,
25 in this case the language in the standard says that we

1 should put an arrow board but I don't think I need it. So
2 at least they have like maybe half a dozen cases and we say,
3 in these cases you do not need an arrow board.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think that would be
5 very helpful, even though I won't be around to vote on it.
6 Just with -- I have this lingering concern. We have so many
7 projects that are being awarded. There are light rail
8 projects, there are subway projects, there are bridge
9 retrofit projects. And if we dilute it completely to change
10 the "should" to a "may" I think that's throwing too much
11 away. But I think if you could clarify those situations
12 where an arrow board is indeed overkill. I mean, if you're
13 going to do it for two hours I don't know that you need an
14 arrow board. But if you could come back with clarifying
15 those situations I think it would be really helpful.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Great recommendation. We
17 may not get them all but I think, I think it will be easier
18 to define those situations rather than try to create a
19 blanket that everything, that everything works within.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so we'll bring
21 this item back.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's move to the
23 second one.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

25 MR. WINTER: I'll move into the next part of this

1 agenda item, which was a proposal to change Section 6A.01.
2 This has to do with the typical applications that are shown
3 in Section 6H. The San Francisco MTA, apparently their
4 practice is to use the typical applications. And they are
5 reading quite literally into the standard statement that
6 says a traffic control plan needs to be developed. And so
7 they are distinguishing that a typical application is not a
8 traffic control plan. And so they are asking that some
9 consideration be given here that a typical application in
10 the Manual could serve as the traffic control plan.

11 I do agree. I think where Mr. Fisher was going
12 with this is it's not written correctly in what you see
13 there because if you are -- if you are seeing that as an
14 option you can't use the word "shall."

15 So simply a change that I want to suggest to this
16 is that the wording instead say "the Engineer or the
17 Engineer's designee of the public agency or authority having
18 jurisdiction over the highway may use engineering judgment
19 in selecting and then directing the use of typical
20 application(s) from Chapter 6H in fulfillment of the
21 requirement for a TTC plan."

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do you have a copy of
23 that language, Bill, for Devinder, please?

24 MR. WINTER: I have it written out here but I can
25 hand it in.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

2 MR. WINTER: And again, this could still be headed
3 as an Option because now the use of the word "may." But
4 it's -- it's helping the reader to equate a typical
5 application with a TTC plan.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So can we -- okay, I
7 think we understand, understand that proposal. And I'll
8 read it again just to make sure we are all in agreement.

9 "When typical applications from Chapter 6H
10 are to be used the Engineer or the Engineer's
11 designee of the public agency or authority having
12 jurisdiction over the highway may use engineering
13 judgment in selecting and then directing the use
14 of a typical application from Chapter 6H in
15 fulfillment of the requirement for a TTC plan."

16 So that would allow someone to use one of these
17 typical drawings and determine if it's sufficient to use as
18 a TTC plan. And I know we struggled with that as well.

19 MR. WINTER: And I think where this is coming from
20 is a literal interpretation is a plan needs to be generated
21 and approved, perhaps even stamped by the engineer for use.
22 And in some, again, short duration or other types of
23 routine work that that's not practical. I know we've gotten
24 some feedback from utility companies and others that they'd
25 prefer standardization. At least having typical

1 applications in the Manual does provide that form of
2 standardization. So this allows a nexus to really be drawn
3 that a typical application could fulfill that requirement of
4 the traffic -- it doesn't minimize it either. It still
5 highlights the fact that there is a form of a traffic
6 control plan.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Where would you insert
8 this language in 6A.01? Before or after what paragraph?

9 MR. WINTER: I think keeping it where it's
10 suggested in your agenda just instead -- it's the rewrite of
11 it. As an Option statement. To make it consistent with our
12 Option statement should be where it --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So it would be
14 on page 1020 after -- it would be at the end of part -- it
15 would be the end of Chapter 6A, as I understand it.

16 MR. WINTER: Correct. I believe what you see
17 there at the bottom of that page was added by California,
18 it's i blue in the current, you know, the 2012 CA MUTCD.
19 And again, as agencies have read this they have read it
20 quite literally that a traffic control plan needs to be
21 created. Actually it doesn't, it's missing the word
22 "temporary" traffic control plan there but -- and that's
23 more just a minor grammatical. But as the standard term,
24 the suggestion here is to simply add below that as option to
25 the standard that you may use a typical application to

1 fulfill that requirement.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Bill, you're proposing
3 it after paragraph 13?

4 MR. WINTER: I'm looking at paragraph 18 --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Eighteen.

6 MR. WINTER: -- On page 1028.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. So it
8 would be the very end of that section.

9 Discussion among the voting members here?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I have a question with
11 regard to these traffic control plans. Are they signed by
12 any engineer?

13 MR. WINTER: And that's where the rub comes is
14 that typically -- yes, traffic control plans are generated.

15 As John mentioned you have major projects or things going
16 on where it's very appropriate to come up with a very
17 comprehensive traffic control plan. However, in the context
18 of how Chapter 6 is now laid out, it's a very global
19 statement to say a temporary traffic control plan that could
20 cover a maintenance -- as it says here, a maintenance
21 project or some other shorter duration type of work. And
22 it's time-consuming to generate the kind of a plan that you
23 would normally use, that's why we have the typical
24 applications in the Manual. And Chapter 6H talks about the
25 relevance of the typical application.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, let me rephrase my
2 question. Are the typical applications signed by an
3 engineer before they're presented to a public entity?

4 MR. WINTER: They're -- generally if it's in the
5 form of a permit, yes, the permit itself is stamped, issued,
6 you know. And it's approved by the engineer.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, just a second. No,
8 I'm not referring to that. I am responsible for
9 encroachment permits for the state of California for
10 Caltrans and we do not accept unsigned traffic control plans
11 as part of a permit submittal. So my question is, as part
12 of a permit submittal, for example, are any of these traffic
13 control plans that are somewhat generic or typical
14 applications, are they signed by any engineer as part of
15 their submittal for their permit work?

16 MR. WINTER: Well it doesn't -- the language, if
17 you want to make that clarification to it, the engineer or
18 engineer's designee must sign the typical application,
19 that's fine. The option statement as I gave it to John just
20 now, it still notes that the engineer has to approve their
21 use.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay.

23 MR. WINTER: So if the word "sign," if approval
24 needs to take the form of actual wet signature, I'll leave
25 that to you if you want to make it that, that further of a

1 refinement.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'm still confused. The
3 person who submits the permit application is the person that
4 I would expect signs those plans. Not the government
5 engineer, the local agency engineer. It would be the person
6 who says, I want to do this work and I'm responsible for it.

7 So with your proposal is there anything that
8 requires that person who wants to do work on the local
9 highway system or the state highway system to sign those
10 plans? Or do they simply point to the MUTCD and say, my
11 project is kind of like this, let me go out there.

12 MR. WINTER: Well they could do that but it's a
13 "may" statement. So it's, again, up to your discretion if
14 you even want to accept that. You still are governed by the
15 standard.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But still the
17 jurisdiction has to approve what work occurs on the public
18 roadway.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So the state of
20 California can create a process by which traffic control
21 plans are approved in the state of California. But in our
22 local jurisdictions oftentimes traffic control plans that
23 are submitted to us are not submitted and signed by a
24 registered engineer. They are signed -- they are prepared
25 by a traffic control contracting company, they're submitted

1 to us by a utility company, and they have somebody that has
2 the artistic capability or computer aided drafting
3 capability to draw something up that says, this is what
4 we're going to go out there and do, can we go do this? And
5 then we -- then we issue them a permit.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. So you indicate
7 your approval by signing a permit.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Correct.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But you indicate your
10 approval in some fashion, whether it's your signature on the
11 plan or your stamp or your signing a permit.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Then what we have done
13 for some -- sorry. What we have done for some utility
14 companies is we have had typical things so that they don't
15 have to -- so that when they're going out at 2 a.m. in the
16 morning on an emergency call on a manhole or an electrical
17 box we just say if it's a five lane roadway versus a three
18 lane roadway versus a two lane roadway use this approach.
19 And then their people can do it really quick on the fly and
20 have something safe out there in the roadway. And then the
21 next day they just let us know that they were out there.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just to echo what
25 Mr. Jones said. These are all local matters. MUTCD should

1 not dictate this. If the locals decide that regardless of
2 the type of the project they don't want any engineer's stamp
3 it's their local call.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well Bill's proposal
5 as I understand it didn't require an engineer's stamp.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because as Mr. Jones
7 also said, utility companies, usually they have their
8 franchise agreement and they just come and they have a copy
9 of the watch page that applies to that closure or detour.
10 And they get --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But still the
12 engineer indicates his approval by signing the permit.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And the people at the
14 counter will approve it in the cities, they're not engineers
15 either.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: They're a designee.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: They're a designee,
18 yeah. But there is no engineer involved, period. So we
19 don't want to mandate and make it too difficult that any
20 simple utility work in a city should have three engineers
21 involved.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But his language says
23 engineer or engineer's designee.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Maybe for Caltrans'
25 benefit we could just be clear. I mean, for example, we've

1 got this typical 6H-6, you know. So if somebody was going
2 to redo their driveway or something, you know. Why have a
3 resident hire an engineer to do a formal plan when we can
4 just make a two-sided copy of this figure and we say, your
5 traffic control needs to meet this standard and we attach it
6 to their encroachment permit and we're done. So the problem
7 simply is that some engineers have run into a problem with
8 this new language and they just want to make it possible to
9 make a copy of this rather than making a unique drawing
10 every time and attaching that to a driveway encroachment
11 permit.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And just a note. I
13 think if we go into those type of discussions we are going
14 way over our mandate. Neither this committee nor Caltrans
15 nor the MUTCD has the legal authority to put such mandate on
16 locals. So it's a local decision. If they want somebody on
17 the back of a napkin draw something and they give a permit,
18 it's the local call.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, but I'm not sure
20 I agree or understand. Right now a TTC is required.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes, but --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: This language would
23 make it easier on jurisdictions by saying, instead of
24 preparing a draft traffic control plan you could make a copy
25 of the typical application and say, here is what I'm going

1 to do and the jurisdiction can approve it. Whether they
2 approve the permit or sign on the plan or what.

3 I know this issue has come up in my jurisdiction
4 many times and the staff is saying, no, I need a full
5 traffic control plan. I'm saying, just take a typical
6 application. This language would allow us to do that.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. The proposed
8 language.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The proposed language.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think it would make
12 it easier on local jurisdictions just to pull 6H-22 or
13 whatever it is and say, do this. L=300 feet, approved.
14 Johnny.

15 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Sorry
16 I skipped out a little bit.

17 I am not sure if you had covered this but
18 basically I do want to just for everyone's information point
19 out that Section 6G.01 that I have brought up on the screen.

20 This is also something new that relates to the matter at
21 hand and it's a little bit with a different bend. Basically
22 in 6G.01 this new paragraph was added which says, for any --
23 this is Section 6G.01 paragraph 04. It says:

24 "For any planned special event that will have
25 an effect on the traffic on any street or highway

1 TTC plans should be developed in conjunction with
2 and be approved by the agency or agencies that
3 have jurisdiction over the affected roadway."

4 So whatever you decide for the other item, it will
5 have an effect here because it --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But the process and
7 the level of the qualification of the individual involved in
8 preparation and approval is a local matter. MUTCD cannot
9 tell them. It's like I'm saying that, oh, it has to be
10 approved by a registered engineer in the city. No, the
11 cities may designate it to a secretary at the counter. It's
12 their call.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It's not even the
15 purview of MUTCD to tell them how to approve it.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You know, I'm noticing
17 one thing, though. The very next sentence, paragraph 05
18 says "typical applications should be altered when necessary
19 to fit the conditions of a particular TTC zone. Does that
20 not accomplish some of the language that you had proposed,
21 Bill?

22 MR. WINTER: Well, I think if nothing else it
23 highlights that a typical application is directly used in
24 the TTC zone. That particular sentence that, John, you just
25 read, it doesn't say TTC plan. And realize, where I

1 introduced this, where I brought this from is a literal
2 reading today of a TTC plan doesn't allow for anything other
3 than a plan. There's not the discretion or engineering
4 judgment as to how the plane is created or used. If you
5 have a typical application, what this says is, yeah, the
6 typical application is fine for your TTC zone. Johnny
7 pointed that paragraph out to you but what I'm now saying,
8 it's back up in 6A.01.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: 6H.01 paragraph 01
10 also says: "In many instances appropriate TTC plan is
11 achieved by combining features from various typical
12 applications."

13 MR. WINTER: Again, that gives you kind of the
14 sense that the intent here is using typical applications is
15 sufficient to establish your controls in that, in that zone.
16 The relevance is before that decision is made, I agree, it
17 needs to be considered by the engineer or whoever the
18 engineer designates as the one to make that determination.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you.
20 Before we go to the audience any further discussion here?
21 Don.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. I am certainly in
23 favor of making things as simple as possible for local
24 agencies. What I am concerned about is that this will make
25 things too simple for my agency. Not my agency itself, my

1 customers. If we follow this process, the way I envision
2 it, if we have to, and I believe that that's the direction
3 we were trying to go with Caltrans. But if you're saying
4 that when we issue the permit we have approved their traffic
5 handling plan, then we are responsible for anything that
6 goes wrong out there. If they have their engineer sign
7 those plans then they have an obligation or they share that
8 responsibility.

9 Now I understand what you're saying about small
10 projects and we currently encourage people to use our
11 standard plans signed by an engineer who is employed by
12 Caltrans. But we routinely turn away people who come in
13 with that napkin saying, well I think this is what we're
14 going to do and I think this is going to work and trust me
15 on this. Because trust me only goes as far as the wallet
16 opening. And once the wallet opens it is our responsibility
17 and we're stuck with it. So I just want to make sure that I
18 understand that Caltrans does not have to take this easy
19 road.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And Caltrans can say
21 that we will not -- or any agency in California can say, we
22 will not accept any temporary traffic control plan without
23 the signature and the stamp of registered civil engineer,
24 regardless of the time and duration and type of project,
25 it's their call.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, and so nothing --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It's an internal
3 policy.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Nothing that is proposed
5 today would change that?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. I mean, that's a
7 local call and agency call.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I don't have resources in
9 my local agency to do a traffic control plan operation
10 process similar to Caltrans so we have to do things just a
11 little differently. And we're approving so many of them on
12 a regular basis with the utility companies coming in that we
13 have to have it at the counter where one of our technicians
14 at the counter can sign off on it as soon as possible.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: But why do you, why do
16 you not make the utility company come to you with a signed
17 plan?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: We're just trying to be
19 business-friendly in our communities.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, you can require
21 that but ultimately the public agency has to say yea or nay
22 to the plan they present to you, whether it's the permit
23 signature or whatever it is.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we require for

1 projects that are initiated by our transit agency or such to
2 come up with a traffic control plan and we approve it or
3 have them revise it. But in some simple cases I know for us
4 it would be a lot easier, especially with utility companies,
5 just to say, okay, Typical Application 16 is sufficient.
6 And right now there is nothing in the CA MUTCD which says
7 you can do that. It kind of implies it but I think Bill's
8 language more directly gets to it.

9 MR. WINTER: Again, Bill Winter. The language
10 here is just reiterating the typical applications in the
11 manual for just as John described it, if a utility company
12 wants to come in and use them or any permittee wants to come
13 in and use them.

14 By virtue of them being in the MUTCD there is some
15 validation to them as a good tool. And this other language
16 that is already in there about them speaks to that, that it
17 is a good tool for that purpose.

18 The utility companies, you mentioned that. I know
19 they have gone through an effort to create standard plans of
20 their own. I am not suggesting that we insert language here
21 saying, well, we'll use the utility company's manual that
22 they have developed as a substitute. I'm not -- I don't
23 think any of us are there. That is going to require a lot
24 more, more study to see if that's the tool. Although maybe
25 a local agency would want to use it and there may still be

1 some discretion to go ahead and use that if they chose to.
2 But that is still up to those individual entities if they
3 would go with what the utility companies have suggested as a
4 standard plan.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, what's the sense
6 of the Committee on this? Rick.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: I would also like to
8 go ahead and note that I think this is a good stop-gap
9 measure to deal with these typical details that are shown in
10 the MUTCD that have yet to be drawn into official Caltrans
11 standard plans. And I think we should encourage Caltrans to
12 look at these details and transform them into standard plan
13 details that could then be referred to. That way they are
14 covered by an engineer's stamp that this is good for this
15 particular condition.

16 In my jurisdiction we try to use the Caltrans
17 standard plan as much as possible for traffic control. If
18 it doesn't fit then we send an applicant back with the
19 specific requirements to get an engineer-prepared traffic
20 control plan. So that the first cut that we look at is did
21 Caltrans already invent the wheel so that we don't have to
22 go through any more work than what's already been done.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you. Any
24 other comments, Hamid?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, do you

1 need a motion on this?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Are we ready for a
3 motion on this?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion that
5 we approve the recommendation as shown, the changes on page
6 28 of 62, for Section 6A.01 of the CA MUTCD.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: With the today?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: With the editorial
9 changes that Bill Winter submitted to Devinder.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: With the editorial
11 changes.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, I'd second that.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Did we get any
15 -- did we invite the audience to comment on this? Are there
16 any comments from the audience? Johnny.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just
18 an overall comment to Robert when you said a stop-gap
19 measure. At least for the standard plan, we on purpose do
20 not try to do the standard plans for all the typical
21 applications. And for the reason being that as soon as we
22 do that then it becomes a higher standard for everyone. So
23 we try to keep them separate and only for about T-10 through
24 T-17, a few nine or ten sheets are the only ones that we try
25 to go to a higher standard on purpose. We leave it flexible

1 and open for all agencies.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I'd like to add to that.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: A lot of agencies or a
5 lot of areas have regional standard drawings where the
6 Caltrans standard is deviated from in some form or fashion,
7 be it water, be it concrete work or whatever.

8 My agency has actually developed an appendix to
9 the original standard drawings of about eighty-something
10 additional, a little bit more detailed standard traffic
11 control plans in an effort to be a bit more detailed than
12 the generic plan that Caltrans provides, in order to be of a
13 bit more assistance to the local contractors and the
14 construction experts that are out there so that they don't
15 have quite as much work to do. When we see that they have
16 come in with one of our sheets we're a little more
17 comfortable in looking at and approving the traffic control
18 that they plan to employ.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any other
20 comments from anyone?

21 Then we'll bring this matter to a vote. Does
22 everyone understand the motion at hand?

23 Okay, all those in favor raise your hands, please.

24 (Ayes: Chairman Fisher, Vice Chairman Robinson,
25 Committee Members Bahadori, Bronkall, Ciccarelli,

1 Jones, Knowles, Ricks and Shrader.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Nine. All those who
3 object?

4 (Opposed: Committee Member Fogle.)

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And no abstentions.
6 Nine-one-zero, no abstentions. Thank you.

7 MR. WINTER: Thank you.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: At this point we are
9 going to take a 20 minute break, be back by two o'clock.
10 Yes, Roberta.

11 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Let me give you some information
12 on the cafeteria.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

14 MS. McLAUGHLIN: It's on the eighth floor, it's
15 only open until two. We double-checked, it's two o'clock.
16 And they have some packaged sandwiches and boxed salads.
17 And I believe they still have hot soup, there will be hot
18 soup available. There is no grill, there's just a minimal
19 grilled cheese sandwich or something but their cafeteria is
20 limited. But they do have drinks and things like that as
21 well.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you.

23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: But it's -- yeah, it's not
24 something that's real fancy. A quick bite.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And there is no eating

1 or drinking in this room here.

2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Right. There are tables up
3 there. If you go up the elevators behind this wall here,
4 eighth floor. You want to go to the right, not to the left.

5 There is a --

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We'll find it.

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we'll come
9 back by two o'clock and we have a number of items still to
10 go over. We want to conclude the meeting by 3:45 so we'll
11 have to move quickly.

12 (Off the record at 1:40 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

2:20 p.m.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, we are going to resume the meeting. It's 2:20. And we're probably going to try to adjourn at 3:45 so that flight arrangements can be maintained. And we want to complete the agenda, as Devinder is reminding me, so let's see how quickly we can move through the items.

The next item is Item 12-4a and that's on page 29 of your agenda. It begins on page 29. It's one that I initiated. In your original packet you had some language. And as Gordon has mentioned and Devinder has mentioned there is a handout. I think the members of this Committee did receive it by mail on Friday, May 18th. So there is a difference between what was in your original package and what is being handed out or what was sent out and being handed out now.

Let me just clarify that the whole purpose of this agenda item was not to change any policy. It was simply to try to clarify tubular markers. And with the prior language many believed that it wasn't clear.

So when I submitted this item and before the agenda went out I had worked with the Caltrans staff and had a preliminary indication that the language we had was okay. And then as it was looked at further it was realized that,

1 well maybe we need to make some tweaks in it. So again I
2 worked with Caltrans staff and we both agree on the language
3 that's been submitted to you. So look at the handout that
4 Gordon has referred to, Devinder has referred to, and that's
5 what we're going with.

6 All we are trying to do here is to clarify it.
7 And under tubular markers we indicate that a tubular marker
8 includes a family of devices which includes portable
9 delineator and channelizer and a fixed-based tubular marker.

10 If you go to the handout and look at Figure 6F-
11 102(CA), all we're saying is that the family of tubular
12 markers as we go from left to right includes a channelizer
13 which has a special shape, a California channelizer that has
14 a special shape with a flattened top and it's affixed to the
15 pavement.

16 Tubular markers also include portable delineator,
17 which has a weighted base. And that's in the middle on the
18 right on your package.

19 And then tubular marker also includes other types
20 of devices with a circular cross-section that are affixed to
21 the pavement, glued down or embedded into the pavement in
22 some way.

23 And we have tried to develop language which says
24 that and we have clarified the language which talks about
25 which type of retroreflective bands must be on the family of

1 tubular markers. There is very specific language that
2 identifies how wide the retroreflective bands must be and
3 how much space there should be between them. If they are
4 this height or that height it changes. So we have tried to
5 match the text to reflect the drawing.

6 And again I will emphasize that this is intended
7 for clarification purposes and not to change policy. So we
8 have come up with new language. Now, the new language is
9 shown in red and the struck language is shown in red with
10 cross-out through it. If you want I can read each one or we
11 can just respond to questions. And so I see that John, you
12 have a question or comment.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a question.
14 I observed that the two types of portable delineators are
15 identical except for anchoring to the two types of tubular
16 markers that have the same height. Is that intentional? I
17 would assume so. For example, the 42 inch one has a minimum
18 of 4 to 6 stripes, 4 to 6 inches wide, and it has the -- it
19 looks the same except it's not anchored.

20 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Correct.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Correct.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And so one has
23 a weighted base, which means you can relocate it.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I totally
25 understand.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Do then those two
3 instances of tubular marker need a spec at the top that says
4 three inches minimum width? That is the only difference in
5 those sub-figures.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It says three inches
7 at the top?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It does in the
9 portables but it does not say in the anchor

10 MR. WANG: That is also correct. Because the
11 tubular markers are following the federal spec and it does
12 not spec out to be a three inch minimum.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: In the figures,
14 right? Presumably it does in the text.

15 MR. WANG: No, the federal minimum is, I believe
16 it's --

17 MR. PYBURN: Two inches.

18 MR. WANG: Two inches.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So that difference
20 is intentional, it follows the federal.

21 MR. WANG: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other questions or
24 comments on the changes before you?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Hamid.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion to
3 approve the proposed changes to the section of the CA MUTCD.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we have a second?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, John seconds.

7 Do we have any comments from alternate members of
8 the Committee or guests of the -- guests in the audience?

9 Okay, I hear none. Any final discussion on this
10 item?

11 Okay, I will ask for a show of hands. All those
12 in favor of the motion raise your hands. One, two, three,
13 four, five, six, seven, eight, nine.

14 (9 aye votes, Member Jones absent.)

15 And I guess -- is there one abstention?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, Mr. Jones is not
17 here.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Bryan is not here.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So how do we count
20 him?

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Just absent.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. That was quick,
23 thank you.

24 I notice that -- I must give credit to my mentor
25 when I was with LADOT. Dave Royer in the audience here was

1 my mentor. And Dave had come up with much of the language
2 that you have here. He got this matter initiated and I
3 said, I'll take it to the Committee for you. And so when I
4 asked for audience comment I was looking at Dave. And I
5 thought Dave would get up and say, I fully support it, but
6 he could see that it was going his way. When you've got
7 nine votes don't say anything.

8 MR. ROYER: Quit while I'm ahead.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. Well,
10 we've gotten through Item 12-4a and we're on Item 12-5,
11 which is the matter regarding uneven pavement. And that's
12 yours, Don, on page 35.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you. In order to
14 speed this along I think I'll ask one of my staff to handle
15 this one. Gordon, would you like to explain what's happened
16 here.

17 MR. WANG: Certainly. This is Gordon Wang from
18 Caltrans. And to speed it along, we are making changes to
19 6H Typical Applications, including Applications 4 and 5 on
20 page 36 and 37. This change was initiated by Caltrans
21 maintenance and LA County. The intention is to allow both
22 the federal signs and California specialty signs to be used
23 during temporary traffic control in order to reduce number
24 of signs carried by the crew and improve flexibility to both
25 local agencies and Caltrans for doing their work.

1 And Typical Application 6. The federal figure
2 only shows a low-speed, low-volume road where shoulder
3 encroachment occurs and there is no guidance on the higher
4 speed facilities. Our Caltrans maintenance allows two feet
5 encroachment on higher speed facilities but there is no
6 guidance. So I put this one together.

7 And we did look at it during the last meeting and
8 Committee Member John said there is no bicycle
9 consideration. So between the last meeting and this meeting
10 the bicycles share the road sign was added.

11 And next is 6H-26 on page 43. The federal
12 language in Note 5 says it may be physically impossible to
13 turn left, especially for large vehicles. A left turn may
14 be prohibited as required by geometric conditions, yet they
15 don't show an optional No Left Turn sign. So I saw that
16 it's quite a challenge for people try to get that from the
17 note so I initiated to add the No Left Turn lane sign to be
18 added on TA-26 and that's on page 43.

19 And then on TA-27 it's a flagger control of an
20 intersection but it does not show where the flagger stations
21 are. So I went ahead and added four flaggers to the
22 drawing, to the figure.

23 On Figure 6H-37, this is -- this typical
24 application was scratched out in the previous version of CA
25 MUTCD and directed practitioners to see Caltrans Standard

1 Plan T-10 to conduct temporary traffic control on freeways.

2 And it was during the workshop that we said we want to
3 revise this figure and make it so the practitioners don't
4 have to go through the manual and go to Caltrans Standard
5 Plan.

6 So when I transplanted the Standard Plan into the
7 notes I missed two points and that was -- one thing was a
8 Lane Closed sign that says "should be placed" and our
9 standard says "shall be placed every 2,000 feet." And
10 that's on page 45 down at the bottom.

11 And also I omitted wording on warning signs and
12 flashing warning beacons, which is -- in the federal
13 language it's Option, "Flashing warning lights or flags may
14 be used to call attention to the initial warning signs" but
15 in Caltrans standards that is a "shall" statement. So I
16 went ahead and added, made it a Standard and I also gave it
17 some specifications on what the sign and the flashing beacon
18 shall be.

19 And then continue on to page 46 is the Uneven
20 Pavement sign. We discussed this before. Again, it was --
21 and that was during the last meeting in San Diego that we
22 did not agree with the language and that Johnny tried to
23 cook on the fly and draw up some language within the ten
24 minutes given and was unsuccessful. We decided to go home,
25 do our homework, bring the new language and that was done

1 with -- we have done that and changed the language and here
2 is the final language we are proposing.

3 And that is a quick introduction to this item.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Gordon, question.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: John.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Gordon, question.

7 On Figure 6H-26, the center of an intersection closure, TA-
8 26. For the placement of the No Left Turn graphic signs I
9 see two possible placements, one at curbside and one on the
10 center line, the new center line shielded by the cones. Is
11 the intention here to show that either placement may be
12 used?

13 MR. WANG: That was a question that arose last
14 time. If you see Note 5 on the previous page, on page 42,
15 in the red text is edits. "If used, optional No Left Turn
16 signs may be placed on left side of approaching traffic. If
17 space is limited they may be placed on right side of
18 approaching traffic." So the left hand side will be the
19 preferred placement and put on the right if there is a space
20 issue.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I had a question of
22 either you, Gordon, or you, Don. On page 38 and on page 42
23 there is that note regarding refer to Section 5A.01 for he
24 low-volume roads. And based on our previous action do we --
25 is Caltrans' proposal now to strike that note?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes, we would treat this
2 as we discussed earlier.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Okay, any
4 questions on the proposal at hand here from Committee
5 Members?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion we
9 approve the item as presented with the changes as discussed
10 and the clarification that you made about Section 5A.01.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually I have a
12 minor edit question on page 38 paragraph 15. Is the name of
13 the W11-1 the Bicycle Crossing sign? I don't think it's a
14 Bicycle Crossing sign, it's just a warning sign.

15 MR. WANG: That language appeared under many other
16 typical applications. The federal way of doing the bicycle
17 warning signs is they use a warning sign with a bicycle
18 symbol and they call it the Bicycle Crossing sign. It's
19 basically just a 48-by-48 diamond orange sign with a bicycle
20 symbol in the middle.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I understand what
22 the sign is. But it's a misconception that it is only used
23 in a crossing context. I'd like to, wherever possible,
24 strike out the use of the word "crossing" in relation to the
25 sign. It's a general warning that bicycles could be

1 present. Sometimes it's used in a crossing conflicts
2 context and sometimes it's not.

3 MR. WANG: That is the sign name given by the
4 federal government. I don't know if we have -- no, it's
5 not?

6 MR. BHULLAR: It's just bicycle. But I'll verify
7 it.

8 MR. WANG: Can you, please. Johnny is verifying
9 that information.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Hamid.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Gordon, signs don't
13 have names. We have made up names for them. As long as the
14 number is accurate it doesn't matter what you call it.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

16 MR. WANG: We can simply call it the "bicycle
17 symbol sign." I think that would clarify a lot of issues.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny is looking up
19 what the MUTCD calls it, correct?

20 MR. WANG: Okay.

21 MR. BHULLAR: It's called "Bicycle Warning Sign."

22 MR. WANG: Okay. So it's a typo on my part. I
23 will go back and look for all cases throughout Part 6 where
24 "Bicycle Crossing Sign" name is used and change it to
25 "Bicycle Warning Sign."

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so there would
2 be that editorial change.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think some of the
4 misconception may have come about because it is similar to
5 the pedestrian W11-2 sign, which is almost exclusively used
6 on either the crosswalk position itself or in advance of the
7 crosswalk so the ped warning sign has come to be associated
8 with crosswalks. Whereas bicycle sign W11-1 is used in a
9 wider context. That's all I need to say about that.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Johnny.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. Actually I would
12 say in Gordon's defense, it's not his mistake. But we have
13 in the California version and even in the existing current
14 official version, somehow we started calling the W11-1 in a
15 number of places where we have the blue language we called
16 it "Bicycle Crossing;" at other places we just left it as
17 "Bicycle." And the feds call it "Bicycle Warning."

18 And this again one of those additions of the two
19 non-motorized team members on the Committee catching these
20 things. So we need to also when -- we might bring back then
21 also so that we are consistent throughout the Manual. We
22 have it in three different types, "Bicycle Warning, Bicycle
23 Crossing" and just the word "Bicycle." So we will clean
24 that up in the future.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I have

1 noticed that it is not only the bicycle warning or crossing
2 or something. We are giving names to signs. Signs do not
3 have names; signs have number designations. So I know that
4 is a tradition we have been carrying from God knows what,
5 '40s, '50s, whatever. But maybe it's time to start looking
6 at these things. Because some of the other traffic signs,
7 we are assigning names to signs. Signs don't have names.
8 So just for consistency. And I have a few of them that I
9 will send to Mr. Bhullar that the feds carry it in their
10 documents and we do it and that causes this kind of
11 confusion. That's why we have the sign chart. It does not
12 assign names to signs, it assigns numbers and letters.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I agree that that
14 makes it unambiguous to a practitioner.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The problem is in
17 colloquial use in discussion of what's possible at a given
18 installation. People do not refer to them by number unless
19 they are sign and traffic wonks like we are.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So it tends to shape
22 the discussion if it has a name associated with it that's
23 inaccurate for its use.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, voting
25 member number eight. (Laughter.)

1 I think we started to have a motion on the table
2 but it wasn't seconded. But before we get to that it was
3 brought to my attention that there is a minor typo on page
4 48 so just for the record I'd like to mention it. Near the
5 bottom of the page, the red language in paragraph 02. The
6 second line says "in the pavement that are not along a lane
7 line." I think "are" was intended to be "is." So with that
8 editorial change we can move on.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I am not clear on page
12 44, the Typical Application 27 where they have added -- I
13 believe that's where they've added the flaggers. I'm not
14 clear what the 50 to 100 feet, what that reference is where
15 it references. Some of them appear to be slightly different
16 than others and I'm just not sure what the 50 to 100 feet
17 means.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Where do you see that?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: On page 44. If you look
20 at the -- it appears to be referencing the flaggers
21 distances.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Page 44, okay.

23 MR. WANG: May I respond?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Gordon.

25 MR. WANG: The 50 to 100 feet is the terminal

1 taper dimensioning.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

3 MR. WANG: And it is also the new standards from
4 the FHWA to be 50 to 100. This is new for the 2009.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: My sheet didn't show that
6 there's a taper there. I'm just seeing --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, it's hard to see.

8 MR. BHULLAR: It's not visible.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I've got it now, thanks.

10 MR. WANG: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you. Do
12 we have a motion on this item?

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, Hamid.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Hamid, will you
15 restate your motion.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The motion is to
17 approve the proposed changes as discussed with editorial
18 suggestions that were made.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we have a second?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Second.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Second.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. At this point
23 I'll ask for any comments from those in the audience.

24 Please come forward. Come to the podium and state
25 your name and affiliation for the record because this

1 meeting is tape recorded.

2 MR. BARSOUM: Good morning, this is Bassem
3 Barsoum, I'm with Caltrans District 12. I just had a quick
4 question on Figure 6H-26, the placement of the left turn
5 arrow when it's placed in the median. It seems to be in the
6 line of sight. You have two successive signs behind each
7 other, I guess. That regulatory left turn prohibition as
8 well as the Y regulatory. So I'm not sure if this would be
9 clear. I do understand that it is preferable to be on the
10 outside but in case, maybe like some language needs to be
11 added to maybe installation height difference or something.
12 That's all, thank you.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Based on that comment
14 does Caltrans see any need to revise the drawing or the
15 Typical Application Notes that go with it?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'll defer to Gordon.
17 I'm not sure I understood the comment.

18 MR. WANG: The comment is the optional "No Left
19 Turn" sign and the "Stay to the Right" regulatory sign where
20 you see the Y with the S-curve on it. Those two signs are
21 in the same line of sight and they could be blocking each
22 other.

23 My response would be, in most cases the "No Left
24 Turn sign is mounted on a Type II barricade, which is about
25 one foot off the ground, and usually cars would -- they both

1 are mounted low so the cars should be able to see past that
2 sign to see the next sign over.

3 And I wouldn't mind if we changed the preferred
4 location to the right hand side as a default location and
5 put down the left hand side as the alternate.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Steve, did you
7 want to comment on this item?

8 MR. PYBURN: Yes. Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
9 Administration. On page 49 in the Standard statement.
10 First, Gordon, this is a Caltrans Standard statement and not
11 a federal Standard statement; is that correct?

12 MR. WANG: Yes.

13 MR. PYBURN: Okay. The Standard statement
14 replaced a C41P plaque but that's not included in the
15 packet. And we have reservations about approving any sign
16 until we see it.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: For information, what
18 is the C41P(CA) sign?

19 MR. WANG: That was an omission on my part. If we
20 flip to the -- page 47, the Uneven Pavement warning sign is
21 a 48-by-48 diamond sign. However, in order to sign for
22 bicyclists the Federal MUTCD has the bike warning sign that
23 we just talked about. And then -- the information on the
24 bike warning sign is provided by a plaque, and the plaque is
25 a rectangle in shape. So this proposed plaque will be just

1 a rectangle plaque spelling out uneven pavement. It's very
2 similar to the sign except the shape. And it cannot be used
3 alone, it has to be used with the bicycle symbol that we
4 just talked about.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So Gordon, it's a
6 rectangular sign but it's not displayed here?

7 MR. WANG: I wrote the language but I forgot to
8 include a proposed picture of it.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well then on page 47
10 there is a word message only diamond sign that says "uneven
11 pavement." What number is that?

12 MR. WANG: That's C41(CA).

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's C41(CA).

14 MR. WANG: And it's also the same as the naming
15 convention by the federal government. When you have a
16 plaque of the same word message you just simply put a P
17 behind, a capital P behind the sign to indicate that it's a
18 plaque.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So what sign would be
20 above the plaque?

21 MR. WANG: It would be the bicycle warning sign.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

23 MR. WANG: The motorcycle -- the federal
24 government actually said it the other way around. They have
25 a motorcycle plaque under the warning signs. So for

1 motorcycles we will still use the uneven pavement sign, the
2 diamond sign, but we have a motorcycle plaque under it.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So with that
4 explanation where we would have the bicycle warning sign
5 below it, a rectangular plaque that says "uneven pavement,"
6 if there is any inconsistency with the guidelines in the
7 federal manual that dictate the use of plaques and such,
8 Steve, let us know. But if you remain there I presume it's
9 okay.

10 MR. PYBURN: I'm looking.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

12 MR. WANG: And the language on the plaque was
13 copied right out of Part 2 of the federal MUTCD.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: I'd like to --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: -- chime back in on
17 Gordon's Figure 6H-26, the No Left Turn signs. Was any
18 thought given to placement of the No Left Turn signs on the
19 same barricade next to the Shift Over sign?

20 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Side by side?

21 MR. WANG: That would be a possibility. Usually
22 we place the signs up and down.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: I was just looking at
24 co-locating, whether they're vertical or horizontal, just to
25 eliminate that line of sight issue and reduce other sign

1 clutter along the road. And most likely place the left turn
2 sign right where you want it, where the driver's eye is
3 going to be, where someone is going to try to make that left
4 hand turn right before the obstacle in the middle of the
5 road.

6 MR. WANG: We have four different locations so we
7 can show up to four different options. I can certainly move
8 into that location. I want to have the Committee tell me
9 the most preferred location and the second and third and I
10 will write the text accordingly.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well isn't there
12 already language in the Manual that describes where a No
13 Left Turn sign should go?

14 MR. WANG: Johnny, you want to check real quick?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I mean, this is a
16 typical drawing. If it's not inconsistent with other
17 language that identifies where the sign should go I would
18 think there could be adjustments in the field to fit the
19 very specific conditions that are there.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That's the way it has
21 to be. This is a typical. You cannot adjust the location
22 in the field.

23 MR. WANG: In the permanent sign issue it says No
24 Turn signs shall be used in advance of the intersection to
25 indicate that turns are prohibited.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's a different
2 sign.

3 (Committee looking at projected image.)

4 MR. WANG: Yes. "No Right/Left Turn R3-1/R3-2
5 signs shall be placed at intersection to indicate that
6 right/left turn is prohibited."

7 It says: "Turn prohibition signs should be placed
8 where they will be most easily seen by a driver intending to
9 turn."

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can we scroll down a
11 little bit, there may be more.

12 Okay, so it says no left -- I can't read the
13 paragraph but it's near the bottom. On two-way roads the No
14 Left Turn sign shall be placed on the near right and the far
15 left. I can't read the paragraph number.

16 MR. WANG: Sorry, no. Johnny is telling me 13-P.
17 "On two-way two lane roads, one lane in each direction, No
18 Left Turn R3-2 signs shall be placed on the near right
19 corner and far left corner facing traffic approaching the
20 intersection." So no, in the middle of the intersection
21 would not meet the standard.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we could bring
23 figure 6H-26 up to standard if we showed the No Left Turn
24 signs near right and far left, so we'd have to add the far
25 left. I think you show them all near right. Well no, not

1 in all cases, but near right and far left.

2 So would Caltrans be willing to make that change
3 as a condition of approval of this item?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: If you did so what
6 you would end up with is two signs on each corner. At each
7 corner you'd have a sign facing the approach and a sign
8 facing the opposite side of the intersection approach. So
9 maybe some sort of a two-sided barricade.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well no, they'd be
11 separated. I mean, you'd put them near the beginning of
12 curb return. So one sign would be over here at the
13 beginning.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The other sign would
16 be at the end curb return.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Sure.

18 MR. WANG: Again, this requirement is for a
19 permanent sign placement and we're dealing with a temporary
20 situation. Usually we -- it's general understanding that we
21 don't need as many signs as a permanent situation. It's
22 good to match the permanent standard but not necessarily to
23 meet.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Gordon, in a typical
25 center of intersection work is the line of sight to the far

1 left corner blocked anyway?

2 MR. WANG: I think in that case the far left
3 corner would just be the barricade in the center because
4 it's very hard to see across it.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny, for temporary
6 traffic control purposes are we allowed to deviate from what
7 it says in Part 2 regarding the placement of No Left Turn
8 signs?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Yes,
10 for Part 6 in work zone applications, of course that's why
11 the policies and everything is different because most of the
12 time you can do less than the permanent applications.
13 However, since we know for permanent applications the policy
14 is a "shall near right and far left," so the way we had
15 originally proposed our policy, which was trying to at least
16 meet that intent by having those two locations and both
17 being optional, one being preferred, so at least we are
18 trying to show the same locations, one was on the near right
19 and the far left. Not really the far left but at least in
20 the median where that work was going on. So we were trying
21 to match closely to that intent. And of course being
22 optional we are trying to do at least one not two, but
23 certainly both options can be exercised.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you think the way
25 you are showing it here meets the intent --

1 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- of Part 2 of the
3 Manual, okay. All right, any other comments from anyone on
4 this item? Jeff.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'll yield to the
6 alternative transportation folks but just certain words
7 catch different people different ways. I noticed throughout
8 Section 6 whenever we're talking about bicycle
9 infrastructure we call them accommodations; and I notice
10 that when we're talking about pedestrian facilities we call
11 them facilities. To me to accommodate bikes it's almost
12 they're second-class. They're not -- It's not treating them
13 as an equal, it's kind of a compromise. I don't know.

14 I just would prefer -- and we don't have to deal
15 with it now because it is universally used on the diagrams.

16 But even when they're interrupting an existing bike lane
17 they call it a disruption to -- when an existing
18 accommodation for bicycles is interfered with. I don't
19 know, I would rather substitute in facilities or
20 infrastructure or similar words that we use with pedestrians
21 with cyclists because it's -- we want to put them on equal
22 footing with the motor vehicles and the pedestrians rather
23 than -- you know, we've kind of just compromised and given
24 the cyclists this space.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: I think we have to be

1 careful with that because the word "facilities" following
2 the word "bicycle" is a loaded term. It steers people
3 towards the formal definitions of Class I, Class II, Class
4 III bicycle facilities. So I think there's a --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Do you like
6 accommodation?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm not sure that
8 it's --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'm not sure I like the
10 word "accommodation."

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's what universally
12 they're using.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: But I'm not sure
14 "facilities" is the option.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Infrastructure.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Because the new State of
17 California Complete Streets and Livable Streets and
18 Caltrans' Deputy Directive -- what is it, 64. You know, I
19 think we should be looking to integrate bicycle stuff into
20 our manuals rather than accommodate bicycles in our manual.

21 But I think that's just nomenclature right now. We can
22 work over time to get that cleaned up.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me comment on
24 that. I remember when the new drawings came out with that
25 language and I said, who is going to understand what

1 "accommodations" means? They typical engineer trying to
2 know how he should comply with this.

3 The way it was explained to me accommodation can
4 either include having a bike lane that you've striped and
5 signed, or it could include the situation where you have the
6 space to accommodate a bicyclist and that's been taken away.

7 So for example, if you have got a 13 foot lane.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Fourteen, yeah.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Whatever, 12, 13, 14,
10 and you've got parked vehicles there and you've got that
11 extra five feet of space. Even though you may not have
12 signed it and striped it as a bike lane, you have the room
13 and you've provided an accommodation, like on a shoulder
14 area. So you might want to consider for your workshop how
15 you deal with that word "accommodation." It's not exactly a
16 facility because if you have the room but not the signing
17 and striping then what is it?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, the
19 reason I think we went -- the language, the word
20 "accommodation" was introduced is that in some highway
21 projects where there is an existing bike facility on the
22 street, during construction you simply -- I don't care what
23 you do, you cannot accommodate bicyclists in that
24 construction zone. But then you have to provide detour for
25 them. And you provide the safe detour to take them through

1 that construction area which may not even be on that street,
2 which we do all the time.

3 So when you say "accommodate" it means that that
4 facility -- you cannot typically -- we can say whatever we
5 want. But when you are going to one lane in each direction,
6 11 foot either side, that's not simply safe to accommodate a
7 bicycle in that construction traffic detour without causing
8 undue hazard.

9 So in a lot of cases, and one project I remember
10 specifically I was working on in the late '80s was the Santa
11 Ana River crossings. And we had to actually do expensive
12 bike detouring because the bridge replacements, simply the
13 construction area could not accommodate the existing bike
14 facilities.

15 So it says that if you cannot do it within the
16 construction work area you somehow still have to accommodate
17 them. You can't just stop and not do it.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, I
19 think --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But still you can
21 think about it and come up with alternative language and all
22 that.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think this
24 probably is more detailed than the language change alone.
25 It comes down to whether a designated bicycle facility is

1 being interrupted, whether the bicyclist on that roadway at
2 that place has an expectation of an exclusive line of
3 travel, whether a shoulder is being interrupted. There's
4 all sorts of scenarios I can imagine. So I think it's
5 probably one of the things that Bryan and I will have to
6 dredge through and see what all the changes might be.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Well that will
8 be something we can address at a future meeting.

9 Okay, any other concerns about this item,
10 comments? Dave Royer.

11 MR. ROYER: Page 41, Figure 6H-6A(CA). I'm Dave
12 Royer, consulting traffic engineer. Everybody got the page?

13 (Affirmative responses.)

14 MR. ROYER: Okay, the C17 sign. A couple of
15 comments about it. First of all, whenever you show a sign
16 with numbers on it should be XX because it may not be 30.
17 Particularly if this was a 65 mile an hour road. I couldn't
18 imagine pulling down to 30 miles an hour because it just
19 wouldn't do it without multi-staging the signs. Normally
20 you don't drop them down more than ten anyway unless you put
21 in series. So the speed limit it should say "Speed Limit
22 XX" and the advance sign should say "Speed Limit Ahead XX"
23 so determination of the proper speed limit would be done.
24 The same thing with the end, "End XX" speed limit.

25 MR. WANG: Okay.

1 MR. ROYER: Secondly, the sign is way too far in
2 advance. Under the Vehicle Code the sign cannot be more
3 than 400 feet in advance of where the workers are actually
4 endangered. The sign would go 400 feet before the work
5 area. Which would probably be somewhere around the Share
6 the Road sign.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Where is that 400
8 feet?

9 MR. ROYER: In the Vehicle Code.

10 MR. WANG: In the Vehicle Code.

11 MR. ROYER: Also, 6F.12. It's mentioned again in
12 6F.12. So the sign needs to be moved way up near the work
13 area. And you may even want to refer to 6F.12.

14 Also if this was going to be used for long-term
15 traffic control -- but this probably wouldn't be. This
16 looks like more of a maintenance operation on the side of
17 the road, not long-term. If it was long-term it would have
18 a new edge line and a permanent, a permanent lane.

19 MR. WANG: K-rails.

20 MR. ROYER: Yeah, and K-rails and all that.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

22 MR. ROYER: It's a good example showing -- because
23 we don't have anything that really shows the use of the C17.
24 But it's got to be probably somewhere near where the Share
25 the Road sign or with a dimension no more than 400 feet in

1 advance of the work area.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: For the record, the
3 400 foot distance is on page 1062, Section 6F.12, paragraph
4 17. It says: "The C17(CA) sign should be placed within 400
5 feet of the zone where workers are on the roadway or so
6 nearly adjacent as to be endangered by traffic.

7 Is Caltrans in agreement that the C17 signs should
8 be moved closer and shown as 400 feet on the diagram?
9 Roberta or Don or?

10 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans.
11 There are some things we are still looking at in
12 construction, our construction and/or work zone reduced
13 speed limits. I understand the Vehicle Code has 400 feet
14 but sometimes that 400 feet may not be enough for the
15 vehicle to slow down before they approach the work zone.
16 And we have some -- we do have the advanced signing. So I
17 am not ready today to say 400 feet is appropriate for all
18 conditions.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But it's existing
20 language though.

21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: It is existing language. We will
22 be coming back later with some proposed new language It
23 won't be today. But the 400 feet will stand in the text.
24 And if we want the figure to agree with today's text then
25 400 feet would be appropriate.

1 MR. ROYER: Also you would have to change the
2 Vehicle Code because the 400 feet is in the Vehicle Code.

3 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Understood.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Then wouldn't
5 we be obligated under the current Vehicle Code to have the
6 drawing reflect the 400 feet as it is today?

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So Caltrans
9 agrees then to modify the drawing to show the dimension of
10 400 feet.

11 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. On the other
14 issue brought up on roadwork speed limit 30. I tend to
15 agree that maybe XX is a better way to go. Because some
16 agencies may just routinely say, well that's the sign you
17 show because it shows 30 here and that may not be
18 appropriate for all highways so we want people to really
19 think about this. I remember in prior versions of the
20 Manual we had 25 and people were routinely using 25. So I
21 think it's a good comment to show XX.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So that's 20, right?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Pardon?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So that's 20, right,
25 XX?

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Roman numerals.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, I get it, I get
4 it. I'm sorry. Or ZZ or something. Does Caltrans agree
5 that we would show XX?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes, we agree.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any final
8 comments on this item? We have had some editorial changes
9 that have been agreed to but we have had a motion to move
10 this and it's been seconded. I take it we are ready to
11 vote. Any final questions? Bryan.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: (Raised hand) Just
13 anticipating the vote.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, okay. All right.
15 Well, all those in favor raise your hands, say aye.

16 (Show of hands.)

17 Okay, unanimous.

18 And we still have more to get to in our agenda but
19 I think that completes many of the items that we have had
20 for Chapter 6. So I want to thank Gordon and Roberta for
21 making a real effort to clean up Chapter 6 of the MUTCD. I
22 think over the last few meetings we have done a lot of work
23 in that regard so nice job.

24 Okay, Devinder was getting nervous that we
25 wouldn't get to 12-8 and 12-10.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: These are very important
2 to Caltrans.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, yes.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We've got about half
5 an hour to go so let's go to Item 12-8 on page 51.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Let's take a vote.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: This is about MOVE
8 OVER OR SLOW FOR STOPPED EMERGENCY AND MAINTENANCE VEHICLES.
9 I know we had a discussion about this at the last meeting
10 and I think Caltrans has sought some additional information.
11 And based on everything they have heard they have a
12 recommendation.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: All right. The proposal
14 is that we are going to add a new sign in Section 2B.112
15 "MOVE OVER FOR SLOW FOR STOPPED EMERGENCY AND MAINTENANCE
16 VEHICLES." The Move Over sign for Stopped Emergency and
17 Maintenance Vehicle sign may be used to inform road users of
18 the state's Move Over law in California Vehicle Section
19 21809. The sign may be used only within freeway facilities.

20 As a quick reminder for everybody who was in San
21 Diego, the Committee has already looked at this once and has
22 given some very good feedback to Caltrans. The primary
23 message we took back was that the sign should say "slow" or
24 "move over." And the logic behind that is that everyone can
25 slow down.

1 We took that message back to Sacramento and did a
2 little bit of research and revised the changeable message
3 sign policy, the permanent changeable message sign policy.
4 And the message that was posted at the time was "slow or
5 move over." Don Howe of the Caltrans staff worked closely
6 with Hamid and worked diligently to come up with the
7 remainder of the language on that sign. And we drew up a
8 proposed sign using "slow" first and circulated it
9 internally within Caltrans.

10 We went back and got a legal opinion. The
11 permanent CMS sign had gotten a prior legal opinion that
12 "slow" was appropriate. We went back and got another legal
13 opinion. You talk to two lawyers you get two different
14 opinions. And the opinion that came back was either sign
15 would be okay.

16 We then circulated it again internally after that
17 legal opinion and when it got to the executive area they
18 compared that sign with the ongoing Move Over campaign. And
19 they were uncomfortable with changing to "slow" because of
20 the current campaign and they wanted to know what other
21 states were doing. And as shown on the screens and also
22 what has been passed around to the Committee Members, we did
23 go to -- it looks like about eight states and pulled off
24 signs that show that there are at least eight states that do
25 have "move over" as the first two words on the sign.

1 That meshed very well with what we had talked
2 about last time on the tailgate sign as well. And it is a
3 sign that is proposed for use only on freeways. The
4 regulation language does in fact say "move over" first. And
5 it was decided by the Department, despite the advice given
6 to us from the CTCDC which we do value, it was decided that
7 it was more appropriate for our mission to go with "move
8 over" first rather than the "slow."

9 What has come out of this if you'll look at the
10 bottom of the handout with the state law signs on it is we
11 have gone back and reviewed the permanent changeable message
12 sign guidelines and those had been ordered to be changed as
13 well. So you will no longer see "slow" or "move over" on
14 our permanent changeable message signs. The new message for
15 our next campaign, which I believe begins in July, will be
16 "move over or slow for workers, it's the law."

17 We feel that that will carry a consistent message
18 forward. Again I do want everyone to understand that we did
19 take seriously the Committee's comments. We invested a lot
20 of effort in moving forward with the feedback we got from
21 the Committee. And Hamid can attest to the fact that he
22 worked diligently with Don Howe and we did give it our best
23 shot as far as making sure that every comment we got was
24 aired.

25 At this point though the Department has decided

1 that we are going to go with the MOVE OVER OR SLOW FOR
2 STOPPED EMERGENCY AND MAINTENANCE VEHICLES signs. I believe
3 the number that we are planning to put up is the same as we
4 had discussed last time, which was about 100. And I guess
5 that's really about it unless there are any questions.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I make a motion to
7 approve.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I second. Discussion
9 or questions for Don?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Job well done.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: Maybe just a couple of
13 questions, John. The tailgate signs, those are for Caltrans
14 vehicles, correct?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: And the roadside sign,
17 I just noticed one, Nebraska, that talks about road
18 assistance vehicles. And I think the California statute
19 also talks about tow trucks. Hamid and Don, did you guys
20 consider that concept?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, the CVC section
22 specifically refers to tow trucks as well. Tow trucks are
23 included as part of the Move Over or Slow.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: And the freeway service
25 patrols would also qualify because they have a flashing

1 amber light.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The tow trucks,
3 Caltrans or any other emergency vehicles can decide to have
4 a tailgate sign. But tow trucks will not be required to
5 have a tailgate sign. It's discretion. If they can
6 accommodate it, fine, if not, no.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: All right.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other questions or
9 comments from Committee Members?

10 Any comments from those in the audience?

11 Any final comments?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, we have a
14 motion, it's been seconded. All in favor raise your hands.

15 (Show of hands.)

16 Okay, unanimous. Nice job, Don.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We'll go to Item 12-10
19 on destination signs.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: And Roberta will be
21 presenting this item.

22 MS. McLAUGHLIN: We also got a quick introduction
23 to this item last time in San Diego. We had the City of
24 Murrieta come to us and during the public comment period
25 introduced us to what they have planned for the City of

1 Murrieta that is currently under construction. It's a
2 veterans memorial monument within the City of Murrieta. As
3 part of that project they were requesting a sign out on the
4 freeway. We do not have -- at this time we do not have a
5 category for veterans memorial monuments.

6 So this particular item, and I'm pulling up a
7 photo here, or a montage of the freeway and what the actual
8 sign would be out on the freeway. "Veterans Memorial next
9 exit" would be posted on the freeway. And the particular
10 freeway here, let me see if I can -- if somebody could tell
11 me real quick what number the freeway is.

12 MR. ROYER: Fifteen.

13 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Fifteen, okay. That sounds about
14 right. Yes, Interstate 15. This is down in our District 8
15 area. And if you look at this -- you do not have a copy of
16 this.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I gave them out.

18 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Oh you do. Oh good for you.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let's try to move
20 quickly on this.

21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay, yes, yes, yes, yes.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: So anyway, so it's the -- the
24 memorial is actually located in the area -- I don't know if
25 I can get my cursor here. It's like in this area right here

1 which is City Hall complex and it's within one mile of the
2 freeway.

3 So what we have done, and this is pretty much the
4 work of Don Howe, is we developed a new category for
5 supplemental destination signs. If you look -- this is a
6 separate handout as well, which is a little different than
7 what was in the agenda package. And they have that new
8 handout as well? And I don't have page numbers.

9 But the back of the handout, of the text. Not the
10 photographs but Table 2D-102(CA). The category being added
11 is Veterans Memorial Monument so it is very specific to
12 veterans memorials. Maximum miles from the highway would be
13 one for major metropolitan areas, three miles from urbanized
14 areas and five miles in rural areas. It would be a green
15 sign with white lettering.

16 And on the third page of your text handout the
17 language is shown in red in which it describes supplemental
18 signing for veterans national cemeteries and veterans
19 memorial monuments. So we placed it in the same category as
20 our current language for national cemeteries.

21 And I will read the Standard:

22 "For a veterans memorial monument to be
23 signed from a State highway, its location shall be
24 within 1 to 5 miles of the highway (depending upon
25 rural or urban areas). One sign for each

1 direction shall be allowed and it will be from the
2 nearest State highway. The type of sign, whether
3 it is a supplemental plaque under an existing
4 Supplemental Destination sign or a stand-alone
5 sign shall be determined by the Department of
6 Transportation. Any follow-up directional signs
7 on local roadways, if needed, shall be in place
8 before the highway signs are installed.

9 "A requesting local agency shall be
10 responsible for adopting a resolution requesting
11 Department of Transportation approval to install
12 veterans memorial monument supplemental
13 destination signs, or to install signs by
14 encroachment permit. The costs for signs, their
15 installation, and ongoing maintenance and
16 replacement shall be the responsibility of the
17 requesting local agency for the installation and
18 maintenance of these signs by non-state sources.
19 If after 7 to 10 years supplemental destination
20 signs to veterans memorial monuments are not
21 maintained or replaced by the requesting local
22 agency worn-out or faded signs not meeting
23 criteria in Table 2A-3 will be removed from the
24 State highway and will require removal of the
25 local resolution by the requesting local agency

1 for reinstallation of supplemental signs to
2 veterans memorial monuments."

3 And I believe that's all I have to offer today.
4 What you have there also is photographs that the City of
5 Murrieta sent us of the actual memorial monument.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, question.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Michael.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: What action is required
9 to create a veterans memorial monument? The agency,
10 whatever agency has it, what action is required for that to
11 exist?

12 MS. McLAUGHLIN: The monument itself rather than
13 the sign?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Yes. Could it be a
15 private owner that creates one within a mile of --

16 MS. McLAUGHLIN: It could be created by any
17 entity. The public agency would have to come to the State
18 Department of Transportation to ask for the sign out on the
19 freeway. In this case it happens to be the City of
20 Murrieta.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So there is no action
22 that's required that designates a place or a construction as
23 a veterans memorial monument?

24 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Not in the MUTCD. But that's --
25 I don't want to open up the can of worms but, you know, we

1 do not have a particular size. I mean, it could be a very
2 small area or it could be the size of a city park which we
3 have here. But a monument gives you the idea that it's
4 going to be more than just a plaque on the corner somewhere.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any other
6 questions or comments for Roberta?

7 Any comments from those in the audience? I see
8 Mr. FHWA approaching the podium.

9 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
10 Administration. I may be mistaken at the way that the item
11 is written but I had a little bit of discomfort of just the
12 word "monument." If you want to limit it to a specific use
13 like a war veterans monument I think that should be
14 explicit. The way I interpret it is a monument could be
15 more broadly interpreted and you're opening the door for a
16 number of different types of uses, which may not be
17 contemplated right now.

18 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Do you have the right language?
19 This is the --

20 MR. PYBURN: I got the handout.

21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: This handout?

22 MR. PYBURN: I was looking at the agenda, sorry.

23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah.

24 MR. PYBURN: Okay.

25 MS. McLAUGHLIN: The handout -- just for

1 clarification, the handout did have the revised language
2 which specifically says veterans memorial monument, not just
3 monument. So I believe that addresses Steve's concern.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, that's
5 proposed language?

6 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What page, what line?

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, it's on a separate
9 handout.

10 MS. McLAUGHLIN: The language was modified from
11 the original agenda package.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, okay. Okay, okay.
13 So that would be on page 54, the last paragraph, paragraph
14 28A. So wherever we see "monument" it now says "veterans
15 memorial monument."

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Correct.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So does Steve have
18 that sheet before him?

19 MR. PYBURN: I do and I hate to split hairs. If
20 you want to limit it to military veterans or war veterans.
21 Just as a suggestion that you be more explicit. If veterans
22 is specifically defined as that particular group that you
23 want to have a monument to, that's fine.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Steve, what other
25 veterans can you think of offhand?

1 MR. PYBURN: I'm a veteran of a foreign war.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Is that a military
3 veteran?

4 MR. PYBURN: I could be a veteran of a political
5 campaign. If you're specifically of military veterans, the
6 word "veteran" has a much broader definition. But if you
7 want to limit it to military veterans or --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Can we just add military
9 veterans, US military veterans?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: If Steve says that's
11 okay, okay, Caltrans is comfortable with that. US military
12 war veterans memorials.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On that one actually
16 there was a legislative proposal I think last year. Is
17 that, since this is a state right-of-way and Caltrans
18 operates, is this Committee -- does this Committee has
19 jurisdiction to make policy decisions what kind of monuments
20 shall be or can be installed in the state right-of-way or
21 that's a purview of the State Legislature?

22 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Excuse me. The monument is not
23 within the state right-of-way. The sign is on the freeway.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. So the sign
25 that you are putting on this, is that like -- still, you

1 know, I understand Mr. Pyburn's concern but the type of the
2 monument and the sign that you are allowing to be installed
3 in the state of right-of-way promoting that monument, is
4 that like -- is that even the purview of this Committee to
5 make any decision or that's a legislative matter for the
6 state lawmakers?

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Are we confusing the designation
8 of memorials by the State Legislature on a particular piece
9 of highway?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, no, not that one.
11 There was a proposal by someone to kind of get rid of all
12 that stuff and it didn't go anywhere.

13 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Correct.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But this has been
15 discussed in the State Legislature in one form or another.
16 And I just -- the purview of this committee is just science.
17 We are not in the business of telling what kind of memorial
18 sign can be installed on the state right-of-way. If it must
19 be a veteran or if it must be a veteran of a foreign war or
20 if it's a veteran of people fighting for clean air or
21 anything like that. I don't know if I -- this is just a
22 sign. I feel uncomfortable getting outside our little
23 soapbox and trying to set state policy on something that we
24 don't have jurisdiction.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well somebody set

1 state policy, there's Table 2D-102, Criteria for
2 Supplemental Destination Signs. And the only thing that
3 gets posted is if it's in that table, right?

4 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Correct.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So somebody has made
6 policy.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's an information
8 sign.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think once you allow
10 this -- I agree with what Mr. Pyburn is arguing. Once you
11 allow this you pretty much have to allow pretty much every
12 other type of monument period. Because you have already set
13 the precedent. And it's going to be -- you are going to be
14 very hard pressed if someone -- if the County of San Diego
15 comes and they have a Olympics monument. Or City of LA
16 where they actually had an Olympics. If they come and they
17 have an Olympics monument and they want a sign that is in
18 the state right-of-way saying Olympics monument, by the same
19 token you should allow them.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay, just for
21 clarification, we did agree to limit this to US military
22 veterans memorial monuments. So unless the Olympics is tied
23 in with that, it's not relevant.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But what I'm saying is
25 that does Caltrans and this committee have jurisdiction to

1 even limit the type of -- once you allow -- it's like
2 saying, I am going to allow a sign for UCLA off the freeway
3 but I am not going to allow a sign for USC. You can't go
4 and pick and choose the type of the institution and the size
5 of the institution and the proximity to the freeway. You go
6 by those things. So if we allow the monument sign for --
7 monument promotion, whatever guide sign on a state right-of-
8 way, I don't think that then you can get into picking and
9 choosing what type of monuments you are going to allow the
10 signs for. Because it's going to be equivalent to picking
11 and choosing which university is going to get a sign off on
12 the freeway.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: We already have criteria
14 for universities.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But it goes based on
16 size and proximity to the freeway, not the type of the
17 university.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: We have criteria for
19 proximity.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Anyway, I don't want
21 to make a big deal about it. Who knows, this may be the
22 only monument sign request that ever you're going to
23 request. But once you allow these things then it's down a
24 slippery slope.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, if they develop

1 criteria for military veterans monuments are you concerned
2 that this may open the door for other types of monuments to
3 be signed from the freeway?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, what I am saying
5 is that once you allow a sign on the state right-of-way
6 promoting a certain type of activity off the state facility
7 you cannot pick and choose the type of the facility. You
8 can regulate by size, by number of students, by the
9 proximity to the freeway, by things like that. But you
10 can't say that I am going to allow a sign that says,
11 veterans of foreign war monument, but I am not going to
12 allow a sign that says, Olympics monument, City of Los
13 Angeles. Because a monument is a monument. The type of the
14 monument and what that municipality promotes -- I don't
15 know, I'm not an attorney and I don't want to get into that
16 stuff. But --

17 MS. McLAUGHLIN: We felt, we felt it was very
18 similar to the national cemetery, which are National
19 Veterans Cemeteries, that are already included in the
20 Manual. And in light of veterans memorials -- originally we
21 were looking at just monuments. And I explained that that
22 was way too broad, that we could not use just monuments.

23 And we were also looking at the AASHTO guidelines
24 for supplemental destination signs and the word monument in
25 there means like national park monuments like Lava Beds

1 National Monument. Instead of a National Park it's a
2 National Monument, for whatever designation that is. Se we
3 were trying to discern from those monuments and therefore
4 we're calling it veterans memorial monuments.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. But it is
6 consistent with AASHTO Guidelines?

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: For distances, monuments and
8 similar distances we have for the national cemeteries are
9 also one, three and five.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. But the types
11 of locations they choose to sign for identifies veterans
12 monuments?

13 MS. McLAUGHLIN: No, they use the word
14 "monuments."

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Monuments.

16 MS. McLAUGHLIN: But we also have other categories
17 on Table 2D-102 that are not in the AASHTO guidelines. I
18 could not -- I do not have those guidelines in front of me
19 so I could not tell you which ones.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So you have a
21 whole list of destinations.

22 MS. McLAUGHLIN: For instance, California Welcome
23 Centers.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Museum, zoos,
25 convention center, military base, national guard armory,

1 fairgrounds.

2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Correct. For instance,
3 California Welcome Centers I could probably say is not on
4 the AASHTO guideline list.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. But I think
6 they have a whole series of things that they say they'll
7 sign for and now they're identifying what other thing that
8 they'll sign for and how many signs there should be.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: In honor of the thousands
10 of veterans in California I'll make a motion to approve
11 this.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I second. We need to
13 move on.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: As a veteran and
15 appreciating what's trying to be done here I can't agree to
16 vote in favor of this. In every one of these things that
17 are listed there's some action that's taken to create what
18 is being signed. If I wanted to create my own veterans
19 memorial out in my front yard and then ask my city to send a
20 letter to Caltrans and ask them to put up a sign, I'm within
21 five miles, I would meet all of the criteria.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: It would seem that the
23 City of Murrieta could simply designate this facility as a
24 park and then request a standard brown sign on the Caltrans
25 right-of-way to indicate that there's a park. And they

1 should give the park a name that would be what they're
2 asking for.

3 MS. McLAUGHLIN: I don't believe we sign brown
4 signs on the freeways to city parks.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I think in answer
6 to your question, Mike, it said it would have to be as the
7 result of a request from the federal Department of Veterans
8 Affairs. So if you put one in your front yard --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Not in this case.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: No, that's existing
12 language. The red has no federal requirement.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So paragraph 28
14 doesn't apply?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: No, that's for national
16 cemeteries.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Cemeteries.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Would it be
19 sufficient to qualify this to be a public facility? That
20 is, a facility established by a local agency.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Or should there be a
22 request from the local agency to kick this all off?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: There is a request.

24 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, adopting a resolution.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: There is a request

1 from the local agency.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: They're adopting a
3 resolution.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And they have to pay for
5 it.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Where is that stated?

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Paragraph 28B.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so does that
9 take care of your concern, Mike?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I can ask my city to
11 adopt a resolution to make the request and I'd still have,
12 my front yard would still be a veterans memorial.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And they'd have to
14 approve it and pay for it.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And you'd have a lot
16 of traffic going by your house and then your neighbors would
17 complain.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I'd buy the fruit stand
19 that I'd set up right next to it.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. We've got
21 to move one way or the other on this. Do we want to amend
22 this, do we want to approve it, do we want to bring it back?
23 What's the pleasure of the Committee?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: We have a motion.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We have a motion, is

1 anyone going to second?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'll second it.

3 MS. McLAUGHLIN: It was seconded.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I seconded it.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Oh, you did?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's get to voting.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any further discussion
9 on this? Any proposed amendments?

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, none.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All right, all
12 those in favor raise your hands.

13 (Ayes: Chairman Fisher, Ciccarelli, Fogle,
14 Jones, Knowles and Ricks)

15 One, two, three, four, five, six. I only count
16 six, we need seven.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We need seven.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, raise them
19 high. One, two, three, four. No, we only have six votes on
20 this. Those against?

21 (Opposed: Vice Chairman Robinson and
22 Committee Member Bahadori.)

23 One, two, okay.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And what other two?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And who abstains?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: Abstain.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BRONKALL: Abstain.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Two abstain.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And Mr. Chairman, the
5 reason is that we just -- first of all I don't think it's --
6 I still don't think it's the purview of this committee. And
7 second, I think that the minute you get into -- you assign,
8 and again I don't want to repeat the example. You allow
9 what gets on the state right-of-way for guide signs or
10 destination signs depending on the type of the activity, the
11 proximity. Like the easiest example are colleges. The
12 state cannot get into the business of saying, hey, if you're
13 a private university or a Catholic university and you have
14 5,000 students I am not going to allow you. But if you are
15 a private university and you have 3,000 students I am going
16 to allow you.

17 We have to have criteria based on the type of
18 activity and the importance and interest that it has to the
19 motorists and how important and vital it is to provide that
20 guide sign to take people to that destination. The name of
21 the sign implies it. The name of the sign says destination
22 sign. This must be a destination of significance. And if
23 it's a destination of significance the parameters of
24 significance need to be well defined. In this case -- I was
25 just -- we have no, at least what I am hearing so far from

1 here, we have veterans memorials all over the state of
2 California, as we should. But we don't go and sign them.

3 If you want to develop a sign to get into that
4 business then we need to come up with criteria. And your
5 example, your example was very well said. You said, we do
6 not put destination signs for city parks. But we put
7 destination signs for state parks or regional parks, the
8 county regional parks. So there is a criteria. So the
9 state cannot arbitrarily pick and say, this park gets it,
10 this park doesn't get it. State parks and regional parks
11 get it, city parks don't get it. So if a city comes and
12 says, oh I want it for my park, we say no, you can't get it.
13 Except if you come up with a development.

14 And in this case I have no problem with having
15 these signs but then we need to come up with a specific
16 definition. And it's a very good, noble thing to do, to
17 have destination signs for veterans monument locations
18 throughout the state but we need to come up with a
19 guideline. And that's the problem that I have here, that
20 the guidelines are still missing, that we are adopting a
21 sign based on a specific, single request. We are not saying
22 what the size of these monuments shall be. As Mr. Robinson
23 said, it could be somebody's front yard. Does that qualify
24 to get the state highway sign?

25 So that's the reason I voted no on this. Not on

1 the -- not on the merit of the sign but the way we are
2 approaching it. The sign has merit to add it into MUTCD but
3 not the way we are doing it.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, I am going to
5 end the discussion on this. And if Caltrans wishes to they
6 can bring this item back, maybe in a slightly revised
7 format. What I would suggest based on the discussion I
8 heard is that when you bring it back next time you might
9 talk a little bit more about Table 2D-102(CA). It was the
10 last page in the handout and I am not sure that everyone
11 digested it. But I think you've got very good criteria for
12 the types of facilities you will sign for.

13 I think it might be helpful if you talked a little
14 bit more next time about what criteria have to be met for a
15 museum or a zoo to be signed. How big does it have to be?
16 And therefore after you do that, does the veterans memorial
17 monument fit into those, that family of criteria that you've
18 developed. I just think maybe this whole table in which
19 you've put a lot of work and a lot of thought, I think that
20 went a little over our heads right now. Just an
21 observation.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: If I may have one brief
23 counterpoint. These signs are for the state highway
24 facility only and they are installed to assist and help the
25 cities and counties with their monuments as a byproduct,

1 getting some people some commerce in those areas. I'm sure
2 it's not allowed to ask for a re-vote but if everybody would
3 take that into consideration and recognize that this is a
4 state highway issue. While we do appreciate everybody's
5 input as always, this just puts us in more of a bind that I
6 don't think we need to be in.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is there a sentiment
8 to consider the information you just gave us and to consider
9 voting on this again?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I am not
11 opposed to the idea. I want -- I think you put it very
12 well. It's important to have proper criteria. I think
13 there is just so much that is not done yet on this one to be
14 considered complete, for it to be considered for approval
15 for this group. I'd like to see some more specific
16 criteria. Maybe something that tells me this is a little
17 more official place than just the way that it happened. I
18 don't see that a resolution of a city council is sufficient
19 criteria for approval of the sign.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: If I might say, could we
21 ask, could we work on approving this one as it is so Rancho
22 Murrieta could install it and then come back at the next
23 CTCDC meeting and further refine it. So it might not be
24 explicitly perfect about his document is a living, breathing
25 document that we can come back up and update.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, we at
2 the Auto Club we are in the business of the motorist
3 information. We would love to see nothing more than more
4 information on the state highway guiding people to where
5 they want to go. I have no problem with introducing the
6 sign, including it. All that I'm saying is echoing
7 Mr. Robinson's concerns that if we do it we need to do it
8 not a piecemeal, single application, but we need to look at
9 the set of criteria. How do we define it, what is the
10 establishing authority, how far they shall be from the
11 freeway or the state highway, what kind of facility this is.
12 Do we want to go by the size? Is this somebody's front
13 yard as a veteran memorial?

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Or who may initiate
15 it. Or who may initiate it.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Or who may initiate it
17 and things of that nature. So that we do not approve a sign
18 and introduce based on a specific application. And then
19 down the road come another application. And then people are
20 going to look at each other in another district and they're
21 going to say, who is going to decide?

22 So the sign itself is good. We as the
23 representative of the Auto Club I think it's an excellent
24 idea. We are in the business of motorist information, the
25 more signs the better. But let's do it right. And

1 especially for something as good as a veterans memorial.
2 But let's have a criteria as we do for other parks and zoos
3 and universities there is a criteria. If I have a museum in
4 my basement and I am right next to the freeway I cannot come
5 and request for a museum sign because there is a certain
6 definition and a certain criteria. That's what we need to
7 do.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you. And
9 We're going to end the discussion on this. I think this is
10 an item that Caltrans will want to bring back, in
11 consideration of the comments here.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Actually I am not certain
13 that we have the resources to continue this so I will
14 probably suggest to Murrieta that they work with their city
15 reps on this Committee.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, may I
17 make one minor technical observation?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Very quick.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Very quick.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Very quick.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Reading Table
22 2D 102(CA) as it's in the 2012 manual. The criteria for
23 major metropolitan areas and urbanized areas, in all of the
24 destination categories has to do with volume, either
25 explicit in the case of convention centers, for example, or

1 implied in the case of an armory which would see the volume
2 only in the case of an emergency.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You mean population?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No, I mean volume.

5 For example --

6 MS. McLAUGHLIN: It's visitor-ship.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's minimum
8 enrollment.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Visitors.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's a surrogate
11 for volume.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So it seems
14 reasonable that a criteria brought forward to address
15 Mr. Hamid's concern might involve volume.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Sorry we were
17 unable to approve it today and Caltrans will do what it
18 feels is best to do. But we are just running out of time, I
19 regret that very much.

20 I was told that Item 10-10 is important. If we
21 can move quickly we'll go to 10-10 then -11 and -12 and Item
22 07-19. I'll ask Jeff Knowles to summarize Item 10-10 in two
23 minutes.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Thank you,
25 Mr. Chairman. Nobody from the City of Stockton?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: He's here.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay, so we do have a
3 representative from the City of Stockton. You have two
4 minutes. (Laughter.)

5 MR. T. GREENWOOD: I thought you had two minutes.
6 I'll be as --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Basically you got an
8 approved experiment, you conducted it, you tried alternative
9 signs, they worked okay. You're going to come back to the
10 next meeting and ask for approval of these signs, right, I
11 presume?

12 MR. T. GREENWOOD: My impression -- I mean, we're
13 presenting like the results of the experiment today. Is
14 that --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You've got two minutes
16 to do it.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: We are just very
18 pressed for time so you summarize it or I can summarize it.

19 MR. T. GREENWOOD: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: How well did they
21 work?

22 MR. T. GREENWOOD: Basically we substituted or
23 took out a large number of signs and put in their place
24 where we -- we did six segments in six neighborhoods. In
25 the six segments that was where we put the "speed humps

1 ahead" sign and then we just did "bump" pavement markings
2 down there. And then in the neighborhoods we put "speed
3 hump area." And internal to those areas with limited access
4 we put markings, bump markings or you have the option of
5 putting signs in there as well.

6 All the household feedback from our surveys
7 indicated that there was really no difference. They felt
8 that without all those additional signs there was sufficient
9 signage. We saw no significant difference between the 85th
10 percentiles and the collision data.

11 And so our recommendation is that we, that we
12 include those options for the W17-1 sign to enable a
13 neighborhood or enable cities to limit the number of those
14 signs and limit that sign pollution.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And they did very
16 comprehensive before and after, you know, resident surveys
17 to get the attitudes of people. If you didn't receive full
18 copies of the report it was very comprehensive. It
19 primarily addresses the sign blight issue we have in
20 neighborhoods where there just seems to be an excessive
21 number of signs. If you post these signs approaching every
22 single bump rather than as we do on curves on a highway
23 where you put in that first curve warning sign with an
24 advisory speed and then you have the "S" the next two miles.
25 You don't have to sign every single curve along that

1 roadway. They're using the exact same design. So the exact
2 same driving behavior is comfortable for every single hump
3 in the roadway.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And the action
5 we are taking today is simply to approve the report that
6 they submitted that's referenced on this website. They will
7 be coming back at the next meeting, I presume, asking for
8 approval of these signs.

9 MR. GREENWOOD: I was hoping it was today but
10 maybe Devinder can --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We'll clarify.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It will be an action
13 item next time. The language you proposed, it will move to
14 the front under Action Items. At this meeting the Committee
15 is going to accept the report and allow the continued use of
16 the signs. So next meeting will be for the language.

17 MR. GREENWOOD: Okay. So in the interim I get to
18 continue using these?

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

20 MR. GREENWOOD: Basically it's still an
21 experimental basis?

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Are we being asked to
24 approve the experiment report, the final report?

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, accept the

1 report.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Accept the report.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Accept the report. So
4 this is going to come back where we're really going to act
5 on it, the text, and the new signs. So do we have a motion
6 to accept the report?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So moved.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Second.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any discussion by any
11 voting member or member of the audience? John.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Not on the report
13 but I wondered whether instead of the rather wordy speed
14 humps ahead, speed hump area, whether "speed humps" might be
15 sufficient.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It wasn't tested.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This is the proposed
19 and this is what was tested.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: This is what we asked
21 them to do.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's fine.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All those in
24 favor of approving the report that has been submitted raise
25 your hands. Unanimous.

1 (Show of hands.)

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I think the area applies
3 plural.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So thank you for that.
5 And I'm sorry that I didn't give you the time you should
6 have had but this will come back to the Committee. The
7 important part is that we'll act on what goes into the
8 Manual.

9 MR. T. GREENWOOD: Okay. So in terms of -- so the
10 options that were spelled out in the report, that's what
11 will come back? Just clarifying.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Correct.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

14 MR. GREENWOOD: And then you guys will vote on it.
15 And then at that time -- then what's the step after that?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: As long as the
17 Committee -- ultimately Caltrans agrees on this new sign --
18 the bottom line is we are not requesting you end the
19 experiment and take down the signs at this time. So we are
20 accepting the results of your study and then we'll take
21 formal action at our next meeting.

22 MR. T. GREENWOOD: Thank you.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thank you for
24 experimenting and waiting all day for us. We need to
25 encourage people to experiment.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We have five minutes
2 to cover three items. The next one is Item 12-11. This is
3 easy. 12-11 is the traffic signal photo enforced signs.

4 As I understand what has come to the Committee,
5 the feds have approved a sign that says "photo enforced"
6 with a symbol of a traffic signal head on it. I think it
7 exactly replicates the sign that California has been using
8 and has adopted for many years. So I think what is being
9 asked of us is just simply to approve the fed sign, which
10 replicates the state sign.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No?

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We are requesting to
14 continue using California sign until the federal MUTCD -- we
15 revisit.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I apologize if I got
17 it mixed up.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Go ahead, Johnny.

19 MR. BHULLAR: I'm Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
20 Basically here it's just one of those clean-up items in the
21 sense that we always try to have a response on any federal
22 interim approval. And this one is almost exactly the sign
23 that we have had in California since '96. So the feds
24 probably used our sign. And based on the interim approval
25 based upon the Missouri DOT request.

1 But we don't want to use this interim approval and
2 their sign because it's a little bit off in terms of design
3 and we're not sure what the final is going to be. Plus we
4 have three sizes, they have only one, which is the minimum
5 size. So what we are requesting here is that we not use
6 this federal interim approval until they make it their
7 official sign and bless it in the National Manual in the
8 future. until then our signs have more sizes and more
9 criteria. And we have been using it since '96 so we want to
10 continue using those signs.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So the agenda item
12 said adopt interim approval but that is not exactly what
13 we're doing.

14 MR. BHULLAR: The recommendation is --

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, but look at the
16 recommendation.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So the
18 recommendation is to continue to use it until such time that
19 the feds resolve the interim approval.

20 MR. BHULLAR: That is correct.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But that may not be
22 until they issue the new manual.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. And for that reason we are
24 asking that we continue to use our Caltrans sign that we
25 have been using since '96.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

2 MR. BHULLAR: With the three sizes.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So it's a sign we've
4 been using, we're asking to continue to use it.

5 MR. BHULLAR: So we don't want to use the interim
6 approval until it becomes official.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I make a
8 motion that we approve the staff request.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I'll second the motion.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any discussion?

11 Those in favor say aye.

12 (Ayes.)

13 Any opposition? Abstentions? None. It's
14 unanimous.

15 Boy, we get efficient late in the day, don't we?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: By the way, these
17 signs are very important. There are 400 intersections in
18 California that have red light cameras and we are watching
19 every single one.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Two minutes to four.
21 Okay, Item 12-12, the update of the flag transfer method on
22 one-lane two-way traffic control.

23 MR. WANG: This is Gordon from Caltrans. This
24 started as a state highway item only but Mr. Chairman said
25 it sounded like a good idea to eliminate the use on all

1 roadways. Basically the flag transfer method is dated prior
2 to the days of radios and cell phones. Two flaggers, when
3 they don't have visual contact they could not communicate so
4 they passed a flag to the last car in the queue and then
5 tell the driver to drive to the other end and give the flag
6 to the other flagger station.

7 And can you imagine, you have ten cars in the
8 queue then you let the first nine cars go and then you try
9 to jump out and stop the last car. The tenth car is going
10 to say, you're trying to make him to wait for another 20
11 minutes so he's going to floor the gas and try to run you
12 over.

13 So we're basically just saying there are so many
14 different methods of flagger controls that this method
15 should be eliminated from California and that's what this
16 item is about.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any questions of
18 Gordon?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: This is probably how
20 they used to do it in the '50s, we don't need it anymore.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I've done it before.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any comments from
23 anyone? Do I have a motion.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So move staff's
25 recommendation.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Jeff moved.

2 Second by?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: (Raised hand).

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: By John. Any final
5 discussion?

6 If not, all who say yea, say yea.

7 (Yeas.)

8 Opposed?

9 No nays.

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And 07-19 we are going
11 to remove from the agenda, I'm showing it as pending.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: They never came back
14 with the proposal to do experiment so we are just going to
15 remove it from the pending.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All right, any
17 Information Items? There are none I see.

18 Next meeting. I'll defer to Michael. When do you
19 want the next meeting to be.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: September 6, 7 or 13
21 of September.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Whatever regular day it
23 would be.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Like I'm saying,
25 September. September 6, 13 or 20, whatever.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: September 7th is a
2 Friday, we usually don't meet on Friday.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, September 6.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: September 6 is a
5 Thursday.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: September 6 sounds good.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And that would be in
8 Southern California?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And that would be in
10 Southern California. Anybody want to volunteer?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I can volunteer to
12 have it at our facility.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Is there likely to be
14 another workshop day? Do we have more things to do?

15 MR. BHULLAR: We'll check it out, we'll check it
16 out.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We still have more
18 bicycle items to go through. (Laughter.)

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So Johnny, you want --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And others.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Let's plan on a workshop because we
22 know we have pending items. Then let's have the same like
23 10:00 or 11:00 to 5:00.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Any chance to move it to
25 the next week?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That's fine, 13,
2 September 13 is okay.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: September 12, plan to
4 travel September 12 morning. So we'll let you know exact
5 time what time we will start the workshop.

6 We can move it either week before of week after.
7 Let's say the end of August.

8 MS. McLAUGHLIN: The 29th and 30th of August.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: That would work fine with
10 me. I may have a concern on the 29th and 30th of August.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: August 30th, no?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: It's fine.

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: August 30th.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: August 30th is great.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And the 29th we will
16 let you know what time we schedule the workshop.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So September 13th
18 still?

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, August 30th.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: August 30th?

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So we'll have four
22 meetings this year, hopefully.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, it's amazing how
24 we get through the agenda just under the wire.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Maybe we can say we don't

1 take lunch until we get through so many items and then we'll
2 hustle up right before lunch.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Or in future start meetings at one
4 o'clock.

5 (Laughter.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, meeting
7 adjourned.

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thank you very much,
9 John.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Let's make a motion to
11 adjourn this meeting in the honor of our outgoing chairman
12 Mr. John Fisher in recognition of his many, many years of
13 distinguished service to the Committee and to traffic
14 engineering, for motoring and safety in California.
15 Congratulations.

16 (Applause.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. And I just
18 may come to your meetings as a private citizen.

19 (Thereupon, the meeting of the California
20 Traffic Control Devices Committee was
21 adjourned at 4:04 p.m.)

22 --oOo--

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Ramona Cota, an Electronic Reporter and Transcriber, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Department of Transportation, California Traffic Control Devices Committee meeting; that I thereafter transcribed it.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 22nd day of June, 2012.

RAMONA COTA, CERT*478